THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

A FEW months ago we commented in these columns on a notable address on Science and Religion by Professor C. A. Coulson ; and we make no apology for returning to the subject, for it is a subject on which the Christian must be up-to-date, if he is to speak at all, and yet a subject where experts are few. From a volume consisting of five addresses and a sermon delivered during a Mission last year in McGill University—*Christ and the Modern Opportunity*, by Canon Charles E. RAVEN, D.D.[1] —we choose a chapter on Christ in a World of Science, since the distinguished author is both scientist and theologian.

Addressing the students of McGill, Canon RAVEN tells them that they do not realize how fortunate they are. He himself started Mendelian genetics and Christian theology in the same term as his post-graduate activities, and found himself in the position of a circus rider trying to ride at the same time two horses proceeding in opposite directions at top speed. Nowadays he sees the two, if not yet in double harness—for problems remain—at any rate able to amble along very amicably side by side.

In that earlier day many scientists held that not only the universe, but the brain and mind of man too, could be interpreted in terms of physical and chemical changes, and that thought itself was a by-product, a sort of effervescence arising out of such changes in the stuff of the brain. Moreover, for the individual there was no freedom and no real moral decision, because he was completely determined by the stuff of the gametes of his heredity. A teacher of Canon RAVEN'S, a distinguished Professor of Genetics, declared, 'We now know that it is impossible for two blue-eyed parents to produce a brown-eyed child. We shall very soon be sure that it is impossible for two kleptomaniac parents to produce an honest child. What will happen then to the Law of Moses, and all your talk about moral righteousness ?' Thus fifty years ago it was very difficult for an intelligent young man to be both a scientist and a Christian, for science regarded the universe as a closed system and claimed to give a complete, exact, and objective account of it, and of man within it, in terms of physics and chemistry. How has the tyranny of this materialistic determinism been broken down ?

Out of physics, whence had come the tyranny, came also the remedy. The most fundamental blow was struck by Einstein, who overthrew the belief that it is possible to get from science an exact and measured picture of a three-dimensional universe. It began to appear that we cannot disentangle ourselves from the universe and, standing away from it, apply a measuring rod so as to gain an exact and objective interpretation of it. At this point Canon RAVEN refers to Professor Niels Bohr's recent Gifford Lectures, in which, taking the wave theory of light and the quantum theory of light as his main example, but also taking free-will and determinism (that ancient and paradoxical controversy) he declared that the human brain was so constituted that when dealing with ultimate reality it could only produce alternative theories which must be regarded as complementary, although on the surface they might appear to be contradictory.

Following on the fundamental change which relativity and the newer physics have produced in our thinking, there are certain more limited changes which have contributed their part to the new relation of science and religion. For one thing the concept of natural law has become less rigid. The modern scientist is inclined to regard natural laws as partaking of the nature of statistical averages, so that there is always an incalculable margin of the variable and the unpredictable. Darwinism itself, contemplating the emergence of the new as well as continuity of process, demands such a view of natural law ; and, indeed, without it one can have no expectation of real progress in the world.

Another change has to do with the scope of science. There are still those who say that only that which can be weighed and measured is a proper subject for science ; but with the general admission of the claims of psychology and sociology to be sciences, it tends to become clear that the only proper sphere for the scientist is the whole field of the intellectually knowable. A further change is the re-assertion of an element of design running right through the evolutionary process.

[1] S.C.M. ; 8s. 6d. net.

Canon RAVEN is less certain about this, but he sees signs, on the part of not a few scientists, of the rejection of the concept of randomness as insufficient to account for all the facts.

The author concludes his chapter by looking at the question of science and religion in the light of St. Paul's picture of creation in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Four points are emphasized. First, creation is subject to 'vanity,' that is, to frustration, to incompleteness. It has not yet reached its goal: it is in the making still. Second, this incompleteness can be thought of as a sort of pregnancy. Nature is groaning and travailing in pain, waiting for that which will give value to the whole process, the birth of the children of God. Third, in this process of agony and parturition, God is involved. He is not merely a spectator looking on from the outside. God's Spirit comes in alongside us, sharing in the agony, groaning with groanings unspeakable as He succours and sustains us, and inspires and initiates our effort. Fourth, since that is so, we need not be afraid. 'Neither death nor life, nor things present nor things to come' can separate us from Him, and even now He makes 'all things work together for good to them that love God.' We give the conclusion in Canon RAVEN'S words—'Now, that concept is reconcilable all the way with an evolutionary concept of creation; not as an act, but as a process; not as something complete, but as something in the making. It is a picture which we can take to our scientific friends and dare to commend to their attention.'

The phenomena of faith-healing, Divine healing, the ministry of healing—call it what you will, you know what is meant—has recently come into new prominence and several branches of the Church have issued statements by special Commissions or Committees on the subject. There is general agreement on certain points, for example, that the Church's ministry of healing is not a rival to 'orthodox' surgery or medicine, that the healer must co-operate with and not try to displace the surgical and medical faculty, that reliable statistics are exceedingly difficult to attain as to cures especially as to their permanence and failures. All admit that failures occur. All admit, too, that not every minister has the 'gift.' Surgeons and physicians admit as freely as 'healers' that mind and body are interrelated in ways far from as yet completely understood, so that the baffling question arises, How far are the phenomena of the ministry of healing due to a psychological quietening of a mind given to worry, so that the natural recuperative processes get a fair chance to operate?

In *The Congregational Quarterly*,[1] the Rev. R. A. LETCH, in an article entitled 'Theology and the Ministry of Healing,' raises a very interesting question. Granted that, after we have made all discounts on such psychological grounds as are adducible, there remain cases which are inexplicable save by Divine help, how are we to describe what God does? The author cannot believe that God personally and directly intervenes through the healer or in response to the prayers of His people. This implies that God is more active here than in the work of the surgeon or physician and may have bad results. The testimony 'God cured my arthritis' may embitter a sufferer who has not been cured. Nor can every case of failure be blamed on the patient's lack of faith. There are cases in which it would be as cruel and false to say 'your continued suffering is due to your lack of faith' as to blame his suffering on his sin.

Nor shall we imagine that failure is due to something wrong with our prayers. God requires no special technique in our prayers. Nor should we say that God heals only when He so wills, meaning that 'God needs to be persuaded by our prayers to do what He wishes to do, or can be persuaded to change His mind in response to our prayer.'

God cannot need our prayers to persuade Himself to do what He wants to do, but He may need our prayers if they are the means by which He is *able* to give help to men. This is Dr. LETCH'S hypothesis. At first hearing it may raise difficulty, but is worth consideration. Dr. LETCH holds that God is present in the surgeon's knife or in the physician's prescription. He uses those means to carry out His beneficent purpose. In certain cases prayer is the means He blesses. It is not a case of God working 'miracles' but God working through 'means.' God is active in every means of healing.

Dr. LETCH then goes on to speak of 'the therapeutic power of the Church.' 'God does not intervene in response to our prayers but He has created the Church and such a community has therapeutic power, because in the New Testament the Church has the power of the Holy Spirit in itself.' And 'healing to-day is not due to God's intervention but to the power inherent in His Church.' 'Bodily illness primarily due to psychic causes should yield to such treatment' and 'even illness in which physical factors predominate should be eased by the prayers of God's people.' 'In some cases the spiritual energy of loving prayers is the means of healing.' 'God needs the energy of our prayers, our love, our science, and our skill to build His Kingdom.'

[1] January, 1956.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

VI. Were Paul's Imprisonment Epistles written from Ephesus?

By Emeritus Professor G. S. Duncan, D.D., LL.D., St. Andrews

Ought some, perhaps all, of Paul's Imprisonment Epistles (Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians) to be dated from his three-years' ministry in Asia, with Ephesus as his centre? I have been invited to reopen this question, which I raised in 1929 in my book *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* and in subsequent articles in *The Expository Times* xliii. 7 [Oct. 1931] and xlvi. 293 [April 1935]. Ephesians raises so many special problems that I shall deal with it only incidentally. My general position is that its strong claim to authenticity is not incompatible with a date in the Ephesus period.

I

In the first quarter of this century, the Ephesus-hypothesis had won support from a number of scholars, notably on the Continent and in America. My book, however, opened in some respects a new chapter in the discussion. It provided the fullest defence that has yet been made (on purely factual evidence) of the thesis that all of these Epistles belong to the Ephesus period.[1] Further I set myself to reconstruct the development of events during Paul's ministry in Asia so that each of the Epistles under discussion might be placed in its proper niche—in relation, *i.e.*, to *data* which may be gathered from Acts, from the Corinthian Epistles, and from other sources, including personal passages in the Pastoral Epistles. In a task so novel and so complicated many of my conclusions were necessarily tentative, and some subsidiary positions I would now abandon or modify; but I still contend that a detailed reconstruction of the historical background must be attempted if this theory of the origin of the Imprisonment Epistles is to carry conviction. In conformity with my general aim I contented myself with only a superficial glance at the theological relationships of the various Epistles; for theories of doctrinal development, like arguments based on literary affinities, ought not to have more than a secondary place in determining questions of historical sequence, and may, if applied without due caution, yield dangerously misleading results. The question of development in Paul's religious and theological outlook calls, of course, for sympathetic understanding, and I shall have something to say on it in this article.

[1] Professor Michaelis of Berne has consistently advocated this thesis; see most recently his *Einleitung* [2nd edition].

II

If an Ephesian origin is accepted, I believe that Philippians comes before, Philemon and Colossians after, the writing of 1 Corinthians. There were thus at least two 'imprisonments,' *i.e.*, periods of detention preliminary to enquiry and possible trial.

In Philippians we find Paul reckoning seriously, perhaps for the first time, with the prospect of martyrdom. What lies behind his references to death in that Epistle, as behind his words in 1 Co 15^{32} about 'fighting with wild beasts at Ephesus,' must be largely a matter of conjecture. Without necessarily holding to all the positions put forward in my book I suggest it as very probable that the Jews at Ephesus, like those at Corinth, attempted to secure Paul's condemnation on a very grave charge. Paul had indeed hopes that the Roman court would dismiss the case; nevertheless he had come to see that Jewish fanaticism was now determined to accomplish his death, if not by fair means then by foul; and might it not indeed be part of God's plan that as an apostle of Christ he should share the fate of his Lord? If Philippians was written during the winter[2] of 54–55, it is worth recalling that in October 54 the Emperor Claudius had died, and that Nero's mother, Agrippina, had then taken immediate steps to have Junius Silanus, the proconsul of Asia, poisoned. Do we allow enough for the effect which events such as these may have had on Paul's eschatological outlook? In Philippians he not merely accepts the possibility of his own early death; the signs of the times seem also now to point to the nearness of the Parousia (cf. 'the Lord is at hand' [4^5], the hope expressed in 3^{20f}, and the repeated references to 'the day of Christ' [$1^{6.10}$ 2^{16}]). Paul's eschatological outlook in Philippians is essentially the same as in 1 Corinthians, which on my interpretation was written

[2] Perhaps after the death of the proconsul and during an interregnum period. In my book I had placed it in the summer of 54, when the proconsul was still alive.

very soon after it. In both Epistles, we may add, he nurses the hope that in spite of all he will soon be enabled to resume his missionary travels.

The second imprisonment, during which Paul is joined by Onesimus and writes hopefully about his expected visit to Colossae, came later (cf. 'many adversaries' [1 Co 16[9]]), and was obviously much less serious. Its occurrence near the end of the Ephesian ministry led me in my book to connect it with the Demetrius-riot; but there is room for hesitation as to its precise setting[1] in view of the obscurity surrounding Paul's movements at that time.

III

The book received a generous welcome from many scholars, even when they found difficulty in accepting some of its conclusions or implications. There were some, however, who rejected its conclusions entirely, and decided strongly for the traditional ascription of all the Epistles to Rome.[2] The first was a Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. Josef Schmid of Munich, in his book *Zeit und Ort der paulinischen Gefangenschaftsbriefe* [1931]. He was followed by Professor C. H. Dodd, in a paper entitled 'The Mind of Paul: Change and Development' in *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* [January, 1934], now republished in his volume of *New Testament Studies* [1953]. Dr. Dodd was not disposed to leave the Ephesus-hypothesis open for further and more satisfactory examination. He was disturbed to find what he called 'a widespread vague idea that there is "something in it"'; and he ended: 'If, as I have tried to show, it cannot stand critical examination, then we may with some confidence assume that the captivity epistles represent the latest stage of Paul's literary activity, as it is known to us.' I am sorry to disagree with Dr. Dodd; but I cannot accept this verdict. I replied to some of his criticisms in *The Expository Times* [April 1935].

The case for Ephesus, however, has not gone by default. For example, Professor T. W. Manson, in a paper in *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* [April, 1939], accepted Philippians as written from Ephesus; but he argued (not convincingly, to my mind) that the references to imprisonment apply, not to Ephesus, but to what happened before Gallio at Corinth. McNeile's *Introduction to the New Testament* cites seven arguments for dating Philippians from Ephesus, and goes on to say: 'No one would hesitate to regard this evidence as conclusive were it not that there is no mention in the Acts of the Apostles of an imprisonment at Ephesus'—a qualification to which (it is then admitted) no great weight can be attached. The Ephesian origin of Philippians has found support also from Kirsopp Lake (*Introduction to the New Testament*, 139), F. B. Clogg (in his *Introduction*), F. F. Bruce (in his two recent Commentaries on Acts) and various commentators on Philippians, including J. H. Michael, Martin Dibelius, Pierre Bonnard, and the Roman Catholic scholar, Pierre Benoit. P. N. Harrison, Jean Héring, and Charles Masson are among those who now date Philemon and Colossians (or at least an original version of our Colossians) from Ephesus.

At this point I have a new element to introduce into the discussion: it concerns the Epistle to the Romans. It is generally accepted that that Letter was despatched at a later date from Corinth; but its composition may have had an earlier history, and been spread out over a considerable time. I have now come to believe that the literary relationships of the two letters suggest that Romans is an earlier composition than 1 Corinthians.[3] I take Romans on the whole to be the product of Paul's prolonged study and reflection at the time when, at Ephesus, he saw opening out before him the way that would lead to Rome (Ac 19[21]). In other words, it belongs in the main to the same general period as Philippians. Thus by a new route I reach a similar position to Lightfoot (*Philippians*, 42ff) regarding the close association of these two Epistles.

IV

There is an increasing readiness among scholars to date Philippians from Ephesus. Colossians and its companion-epistles, however, are still generally assigned to Rome, though Lohmeyer, Dibelius and Goguel have taken an intermediate course and favour Caesarea.[4]

[1] I incline now to put the 'imprisonment' before the 'sorrowful visit' to Corinth, and the riot at the conclusion of a further period of work in Asia (Ac 19[22b]), during which I conceive that Paul visited the churches in the Lycus-valley. There, I suggest, he endured the θλῖψις of 2 Co 1[8] (with which I equate the crisis of 2 Ti 4[16]), when he thought that he might die—had he, perhaps, received from a Jewish court 'the 39 stripes' (2 Co 11[24])?

[2] W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, 179f, dismisses too easily the Ephesian origin of Philippians. Some of his arguments (*e.g.*, that πραιτώριον is not an apposite term in a senatorial province) are very questionable.

[3] A strong case for this has been worked out recently, but not yet published, by J. R. Richards (now Dean of Bangor).

[4] Feine-Behm (*Einleitung* [1950]), M. Albertz (*Die Botschaft des N.T.* [1952]), P. Benoit (in his commentary, *Bible de Jérusalem* [1953]) are among those who assign Philippians to Ephesus, the other Epistles to Rome. A. Wikenhauser (*Einleitung* [1953]) assigns the Colossians group to Rome, and for Philippians leaves the issue open between Rome and Ephesus.

The fullest recent study of these other Epistles is that of Ernst Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbriefe* [Lund, 1946]. When he comes to deal with the place and date of writing of these Epistles—in a brief chapter which seems to me to fall short of the high standard of the book as a whole—Percy notes frankly some of the difficulties of the Roman hypothesis, dismisses the case for Caesarea, states sympathetically the case for Ephesus, then after raising certain objections decides with surprising abruptness in favour of Rome. Are the objections as serious as Percy, following Schmid and Dodd, makes them out to be?

(*a*) *The silence of Luke.* As I have said, I am prepared now to dissociate the Colossians-imprisonment from the Demetrius-riot incident. If that is conceded, Luke's failure to record a light imprisonment, occurring though it did at a time when (as the Epistles show) he was with the Apostle, is not in itself a fatal objection. Much that happened in the closing stages of Paul's ministry in Asia, including the unexpected visit to Corinth and the (obviously subsequent) θλῖψις ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ of 2 Co 1^{8}, is covered in Ac 19^{22} by the vague phrase: 'he stayed on for a time in Asia.' And the narrative of Ac 19 gives not a hint of those Jewish plots at Ephesus to which there is a retrospective reference in Ac 20^{19}.

(*b*) *The conditions of imprisonment.* The confident tone of these Epistles, with their expectation of an early release, suggests that Paul believed that this imprisonment (a case, perhaps, of *libera custodia*) would prove nothing more than a temporary interruption to his work of world-evangelization. The conditions were probably not unlike those of his Roman imprisonment as described in Acts—his freedom was restricted by a light chain (Eph 6^{20}; cf. Ac 28^{20}); and friends were free to visit him, taking turns, perhaps, in attending to his needs and so in a sense sharing his imprisonment. Especially noteworthy is his use of the term συναιχμάλωτος (Philem 23, Col 4^{10}). It denotes strictly a prisoner of war; and I take this to imply that Paul invested with a rich spiritual significance both his own imprisonment and the extent to which some of his associates were privileged to share it with him. Thus his use of the term 'bonds' (Philem 10, 13, Col 4^{18}; cf. Ph $1^{7\text{-}17}$) tells us nothing about the actual conditions of imprisonment; it means that Paul so thoroughly sublimates his experience that he thinks of himself primarily as 'a prisoner of Christ Jesus' (Philem 1, 9, Eph 3^{1}). We may recall how he refers exultantly in 2 Co 2^{14} to those who share (presumably as captives) in Christ's triumphal procession.

V

The hesitation which so many scholars have about assigning the Colossians group of Epistles to the Ephesus period arises mainly from considerations of doctrinal development—though it is noticeable that Percy makes no appeal to this issue. We can see in these Epistles (so it is urged) a remarkable development in Paul's outlook on the Parousia (there is no indication now of its imminence), on the 'mystery' of the gospel (more particularly as regards its relevance for all nations), on the Person and Work of Christ (especially in relation to the demonic 'powers' that are active in the universe), on the significance of the Church and the Christian ministry for the work of world-evangelization, on the continuance of social institutions and relationships (contrast, for example, the attitude to marriage and family life in Col 3 and in 1 Co 7), and on the final reconciliation of all things in Christ. And this development, we are told, can only be explained (if the Epistles throughout are Pauline) by assigning them to a late date.

Recent trends in criticism are doing much to counter some of these objections. Behind much that was once labelled as late Pauline doctrine we are now coming more and more to hear echoes of the Church at worship, of confessional statements and catechetical instruction, of arguments and conclusions which had emerged in discussions in the synagogues and elsewhere. Is it, therefore, so necessary to postulate a late date for these Epistles, or (with Holtzmann, Harrison, Masson and others) to regard certain parts of Colossians as later accretions? Moreover the real point at issue often is, not whether the Letters belong to a late or an early date, but what place they have in chronological sequence in relation to other known Letters of Paul. Colossians and Ephesians are admittedly later than 1 Corinthians. It is also urged (with good reason, I think) that they appear to be later than Romans. But whereas their relation to Romans has sometimes been used to justify a date in the later (Roman) imprisonment, my position would rather be that Romans, as a theological document, belongs to the middle period of Paul's ministry in Asia and Colossians to near its conclusion.

This brings me back to Professor Dodd's article, already referred to. In the first part of it he was concerned to reject the Ephesian origin of the Imprisonment Epistles so that he might be free to anchor these Epistles securely in a later period of the ministry; but all this was a prelude to what came in the second part of his paper, namely an attempt to trace the processes of 'change and development' in Paul's later theological outlook. Here his main thesis was that 'about the time when he wrote 2 Corinthians Paul underwent a significant spiritual experience which left its mark'; and he sought to show how this changed

outlook came to fuller expression in the Imprisonment Epistles, which he dated from Rome.

Here Dr. Dodd writes with great cogency; and I am in cordial agreement with him in the essentials of his plea. I prefer, however, to put this 'significant spiritual experience' rather earlier than he does, namely during those years of acute strain when Paul ministered in and around Ephesus. And like many other great spiritual experiences it was marked, I believe, by more than one stage. There was the stage (reflected in Philippians and 1 Corinthians) of severe tension and turmoil. In these two Letters the Apostle, though he looks forward with strong Christian faith to the missionary tasks that still await him, sees also how the powers of evil are rampant—may it not then rather be the will of God that he too, like his Master, should crown a life of service by dying for his faith, and even that the day of the Lord's appearing will not now be long delayed? Then came the great illumination (he tells of it in Colossians and Ephesians, and there are hints of it in 2 Corinthians) when apparently there flashed on his soul a light as from another world, and much that had been dark or hidden was now made clear by a Divine revelation. The secret ('mystery') that was now revealed to the Apostle concerned the whole purpose of God, and the place which in the fulfilment of that purpose belonged (*a*) to Christ, as the perfect expression of the being of God and as supreme over all the powers of this world, (*b*) to the Church, the Body of Christ, in which Jew and Gentile were made one, and (*c*) to all who were ministers of Christ in the Church, including Paul himself as an Apostle. In this new light (of which there had been imperfect anticipatory glimpses in Philippians, Romans and 1 Corinthians) the old Jewish eschatological hope became transfigured. With increasing clearness and conviction Paul had come to recognize in the crucifixion, resurrection, and exaltation of Christ what he called 'the mighty power of God' in the working-out of His purpose: in these mighty acts, if men had only the insight to see it, the triumph of His purpose was assured. Christ's risen life was seen, moreover, to be an active power in the lives of believers, in the fellowship of the Church, and in his own missionary work as an apostle. Thus, the earlier eager expectation of the Day of Christ assumed for Paul a new form in the firm assurance that God's purpose was to accomplish through the Church a process of world-redemption and world-reconciliation, and to bring the whole universe to its unity in Christ.

And so, though he could not now ignore the dangers with which his life was threatened (and he was still more conscious of these when later he wrote 2 Corinthians, and on his subsequent journey to Jerusalem), his ministry in Asia, as I believe, brought to Paul a quickened sense of the glory of his apostolic mission. Instead of anticipating an imminent Parousia his thoughts are now set on the 'door' that he trusts will soon be open for him, not merely to visit churches like Colossae and Laodicea, but to go out into the wide Gentile world and 'complete' the preaching of the Word of God.[1] In all this it is surely more natural to picture him in Asia, looking forward to new fields including Rome, rather than in Rome, turning his gaze again to old fields in Asia. And though he knows that he may not be privileged himself to see the completion of this mission, he is not unduly distressed, for it is the mission of Christ and His Church—a mission, therefore, in the discharge of which he as an apostle must be ready to suffer and even to die, thus helping to make up, in his own frail body, the full measure of the sufferings which Christ has to endure, for the sake of His Body, the Church (Col 1^{23ff}).

[1] Col 1^{25}; cf. Ro 15^{19}, 2 Ti 4^{17}.

Literature

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHURCH

Books on theology often have a depressingly short life. Not many, written thirty years ago, are still being read to-day, and still fewer are so much alive as to merit translation into foreign languages. One of this calibre, however, is *The Church in the New Testament Period*, by the late Professor Adolf Schlatter. It was first published in German in 1926, and now for the first time has been translated into English by Paul P. Levertoff (S.P.C.K.; 21s. net).

Both author and translator are men of unusual interest. Schlatter was Professor of Theology at Tübingen. He set himself to withstand the theological fashions of his own day. It was the current vogue then to analyse the variety of conflicting opinions within the New Testament. He insisted on viewing the New Testament as a whole, with a common message, to which every part lent its separate sanction. His book, indeed, in many parts reads like the work of a modern writer within the present-day school of Biblical Theology. Levertoff, the translator, was born in Russia, the son of an Orthodox Jew. He was converted to Christianity as a young man, and thereafter made

it his aim to present the Christian faith as the true fulfilment of Jewish hopes. His translation is clear, natural, and pleasant to read, although English was not his native language.

The title of the English translation is perhaps misleading, for the book is not a theological presentation of the New Testament teaching about the Church. It is rather an account of the development of the Christian movement up to about A.D. 120. Indeed it covers much the same ground as J. Weiss's 'History of Primitive Christianity,' or M. Goguel's 'Birth of Christianity.' Its original German title (*Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit*) is a more accurate description of its contents.

Schlatter's position was strongly conservative. The traditional authorship of the New Testament books is accepted without question. Readers who cannot take this point of view may sometimes feel that historical fact has been subordinated to theological interpretation. But those who are themselves conservatively inclined, or who feel somewhat impatient with critical niceties, will find here a shrewd and discerning account of the spiritual issues confronting the Early Church, and the decisions taken in face of them. And for all readers, whether conservative or not, there is much deep insight into matters of spiritual significance. There are, indeed, many pages where the serious preacher will find inspiration and material for his preaching.

The author does not close his eyes to differences between the leaders of the Early Church. He recognizes that Paul had 'a powerful, Christian individuality,' which 'must have had a lot to do with these separations,' and that 'to work with him demanded subordination to him.' But transcending all the differences is the fundamental unity, and the common message which all alike share.

Schlatter gives great prominence to the thought of the 'Church,' and to 'Baptism' and the 'Eucharist.' He anticipates the modern insistence on the liturgical purpose behind the Gospels, and there is frequent emphasis on the New Testament's acceptance of 'the natural order' as the good gift of God.

In a book, which is constantly rewarding, some chapters stand out: the one on the Resurrection (II), the Coming of the Spirit (III), an unusually understanding interpretation of James of Jerusalem (VII), the New Worship of the Early Church (VIII), the New (*i.e.*, Fourth) Gospel (XXXII), where the author finds Paul's emphasis on Faith, Hope, and Love reflected in the three Johannine Writings—the Apocalypse (Hope), the Epistles (Love) and the Gospel (Faith).

Though this book is mainly concerned with historical facts and their meaning, it is a book which speaks clearly to the present, as its concluding words suggest: 'The New Testament became a blue-print for the future instead of a history of the past. It became a promise, an ideal for the Church to aim at and a map which showed where the grace of God was leading her.'

C. L. MITTON

KINGSHIP IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The question of 'divine' or, as it is now more cautiously defined, 'sacral' kingship in the Old Testament has been, to put it mildly, energetically discussed during the past quarter of a century. The need for a monograph in English, or for that matter in any language, has been increasingly felt. That need is now in large measure satisfied by Professor A. R. Johnson, F.B.A., in *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (University of Wales Press; 12s. 6d. net). It is a less polemical book than some may have looked for; indeed, the Uppsala protagonists are hardly mentioned except in the Preface. This, I am positive, is not studied discourtesy on Professor Johnson's part; it is due to the fact that he has a thesis of his own to develop and so does not waste time fighting other people. (The book contains only a hundred and thirty-four pages, apart from Indexes.)

Professor Johnson knows his Ugaritic and other extra-biblical materials, and his book is superbly documented. But his method is to work from the centre (*i.e.* from the Old Testament) outwards to the circumference of general Semitic rather than from the circumference inwards to the centre. As he puts it in an unobtrusive footnote on p. 96: 'In fact, here again we see how important it is to examine a form carefully in the light of its context before attempting to interpret it in a novel way in terms of Ugaritic.'

So far as the status of the king is concerned, Professor Johnson draws his conclusion at the end of the first section. (The book has six sections but no chapter headings.) Briefly, the king is Yahweh's 'Son,' but his 'Sonship' is one of adoption. 'We must beware of exaggerating the importance of the fact that in Israelite thought the Davidic king is potentially so closely related to God. Although, in theory at least, he may be on such intimate terms with Yahweh and powerfully subject to His influence, he is by nature a man; and, so far as his subjects are concerned, he is no more than *primus inter pares*.'

Sections II-IV deal more with the Kingship of Yahweh than with that of the Davidic 'Messiah' or reigning king. An attempt is made, based on the Psalms which celebrate the Kingship of Yahweh and the so-called royal psalms, to reconstruct the pre-exilic New Year Festival with its

dramatic representation and accompanying 'mime.' These sections are the most important part of the book and in them we have a contribution to the 'theology' of pre-exilic Israelite religion, a theology related to a definite place and period of time. It is a more attractive picture than is generally assumed and we are left wondering a little why, against such a background of faith and practice, the monarchy fell into such disaster and condemnation as it did.

The last two sections deal with the place of the king in the festival ritual. The character of Yahweh in the 'mime' was presumably taken, not, as some have assumed, by the king, but by the Ark 'as the guarantee of Yahweh's presence in power with His people.' The king stands as the representative of his people and before his 'fidelity,' 'devotion,' and 'righteousness' are established he has to submit to humiliation and 'suffering.' Whether there is any connection between the king 'Messiah' who suffers and the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah 'lies outside the scope of the present study; but the writer hopes to return to the question in another monograph in this series.' Dr. Johnson will not be hurried. But what he does is always well done. Accordingly, we receive it with thankfulness and 'humbly ask for more.'

C. R. North

THE VIRGIN MARY

Christians outwith the Church of Rome are deeply disturbed by the modern extraordinary development of the cult of the Blessed Virgin within that Church. On the subject we welcome a book by Giovanni Miegge, Professor of Church History in the Waldensian Theological Faculty, Rome—*The Virgin Mary: The Roman Catholic Marian Doctrine* (Lutterworth Press; 21s. net). The book is excellently translated by Professor Waldo Smith of Ontario and a highly commendatory Foreword is contributed by Dr. N. Micklem. The author, situated as he is in Rome, may be fully trusted to give a knowledgeable and accurate account of Romanist doctrine and practice. He writes with cool judgment, not as a perfervid controversialist. He traces the long story of devotion to the Virgin from its earliest manifestations down to the present day which has witnessed Mary's Assumption declared by the Pope to be an essential article of Faith, and when it seems likely that *Sancta Maria Mediatrix* will also become a dogma.

After consideration of the place of Mary in our Gospels, we get the stages of development in the increasing importance assigned to her. First she was 'the Eternal Virgin,' then came the theological concept 'Mother of God.' Then she became 'Queen of Heaven.' Then came suggestion of her Assumption, then her 'Immaculate Conception,' ever-increasing devotion to her as the 'Compassionate Mother,' and last of all the proclamation —not formally yet a dogma—of Mary as Co-Redemptress. A concluding chapter deals with Mary in dogma and devotion.

As a true historian the author is not content to give merely the facts of the development, but estimates their inner meaning and whatever elements of religious value they may enshrine. To Protestants it is a saddening book. It leaves us wondering with the author whether in Romanism Mary will finally eclipse Christ as completely as Isis did Osiris in old Egyptian religion.

W. D. Niven

ESCAPE FROM LOGICAL POSITIVISM?

The underlying negative motive of this collection of essays—*New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, ed. by Professor Antony Flew and Mr. Alasdair Macintyre (S.C.M.; 21s. net)—is the impossibility of dealing any longer with religious problems by using the concepts of idealistic philosophy. This mode of thinking is held to be outmoded and it is considered necessary to adopt the standpoint of logical analysis, even if the writers run the risk of being called Logical Positivists, which label the writers themselves definitely discard. The ground for this rejection is well brought out in the chapter on Otto's idea of the essentially inexpressible character of religion in its depth, and it is argued that whereas a Logical Positivist would say that to ask in religious matters questions which cannot be answered shows the pointlessness of all religion, Otto argues that just there lies its essential meaning.

On the whole this is a depressing book. The essayists strive all the time to be realistic, but they do not help very much in delivering the sincere thinker from his confusions. They are so afraid of being the victims of illusion and so enamoured of safeguards against meaninglessness that they reach very few positive conclusions. Helpful viewpoints are certainly reached but not very frequently. The theistic proofs are dismissed by means of rather conventional criticisms, and the most that is rescued is the suggestion that if the existence of God is not a logical necessity it is at least a religious one. In the same spirit the possibility of religious experience giving us a basis for belief in the existence of God (as this is expounded by Principal Baillie and Professor H. H. Farmer) is rather austerely criticized on the ground that it confuses psychological with existential statements. In this connexion the fundamental flaw of the general argument of this book is revealed—an unnecessary

gap is left between psychology and objective reality, as if the experiences, not of individuals here and there but of men everywhere, had nothing of a revelatory character in them. And yet if 'the lack of desire is the ill of all ills,' many thousands also, after treading this 'dark pathway' have reached 'a jubilant pining and longing for God.'

One of the most helpful essays in the book is that by Professor D. M. MacKinnon on 'Death,' but we wish he had made fuller use of his argument that death is not a mere clinical experience, and his assurance that grief has the 'dignity of validity' and is not merely a hysterical protest in a meaningless world.

W. S. URQUHART

BULTMANN'S ESSAYS

The Rev. James C. G. Greig has provided a readable translation of Bultmann's *Glauben und Verstehen*, Band II. The English version is called *Essays*, and it is published by the S.C.M. Press in the new 'Library of Philosophy and Theology' at the price of 21s. net. It will be invaluable to the English reader who wishes to gain a fuller knowledge of the structure of Professor Bultmann's thought. One feature of that thought which comes out in the book is the degree to which Professor Bultmann has escaped the dangers of specialization. To put the matter bluntly, he is an exceptionally widely read man. After a life-time spent as a New Testament specialist, he has, partly as a result of his knowledge of existentialist philosophy, raised, or raised again, a whole set of problems in systematic theology. The present volume also makes clear his familiarity with two other fields of study, classical scholarship and modern literature (including English literature). It is this factor which has made profitable criticism of Dr. Bultmann anything but easy. For it is difficult for the philosopher to realize the influence which Jonas's researches into Gnosticism have had on Bultmann, just as it is difficult for the New Testament specialist to realize that behind his views on the Resurrection is to be found Heidegger's conception of the historical. To say that is not to imply that there is not a place for criticising Bultmann's views. But the present volume is to be welcomed in that it will give the English reader a better chance first to understand his Bultmann and then to criticize him.

It is the merit of Bultmann that both trying to understand him and trying to criticize him are intensely exciting operations for the theologian. The *Essays* in fact raise fascinating problems and only a few of them can be discussed here. One of them is in connexion with Bultmann's doctrine of God. It is clear that he feels entitled to speak of our relation to God on the analogy of our relation to other men. Thus when he is writing on the difference between St. Paul and Luther, he contends that the former gave up legalism not because he could not satisfy its demands but because the attitude of making oneself count for something in the eyes of God (or any one human) is wrong. What is needed is the ability to surrender oneself and Bultmann notes that many a friendship and many a marriage has broken down because one of the parties lacked that ability. Here there seems a comparatively easy transition from our relation to God to our relation to another human being. The difference between the two is brought out on p. 179, where the author writes: 'Such happenings between man and man are a pattern of what happens between God and man. But what happens between man and man never embraces the whole of our existence. A friend can only forgive his friend the *particular* guilt through which he has become guilty in relation to him personally. But the relation to God does embrace human existence as a whole, and his forgiving grace bestows purity and newness without more ado.' Even so, one wonders if this is consistent with the definition of the mythological in *Kerygma und Mythos* as the conceiving of the Divine as if it were human.

Readers, who have noted that in spite of all his radical criticism of the New Testament Professor Bultmann never seems to have any doubt of the reality of God, may have wondered if he did not hold a kind of natural theology. The present volume will show that that is not so, at least in so far as it would involve taking up a speculative attitude towards God. Thus in his essay on the confession of the Ecumenical Council, Bultmann contends that we are not concerned with Christ as He is in Himself but as He is for us. Why? Because a speculative *Fragestellung* has no place in Christianity and because God meets us in the concrete events of life. Indeed in the very first essay we are told that what Christianity means by the Incarnation is that 'the reality of God is not that of the idea but of the concrete happening.' It is true that we have a conception of God apart from Christ. Knowledge of our own facticity, our own limitations, makes us raise the question whether there is a being without such limitations. Within its limits this conception is good as far as it goes. But it is not a positive conception of God, not knowledge of God, it is only the question whether He exists.

Equally interesting is Bultmann's conception of transcendence. His view is that while some form of transcendence comes out in any description of the Divine—even the Greek gods are immortal—none the less the historical standpoint which is a

consequence of the Old Testament constrains us Christians to have a different conception of the transcendent from the Greek one. The contrast between the transcendent-immanent is no longer the contrast between the eternal-temporal or the spiritual-natural. The transcendence of God means that He is always in the future and absolutely free.

Perhaps enough has been said to show that there is much that is new, stimulating and, in the best sense of the word, provocative in this book. One may close with the warning to the reader that there is something of Hume in Bultmann in that at times a deceptive simplicity of style masks a complexity of thought.

IAN HENDERSON

The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, volumes xxix.–xxx. [1945–1951], edited by W. F. Albright and F. V. Winnet, contains an account of the excavations at New Testament Jericho and Khirbet En-Nitla by the Joint Expedition of the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary and the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. The book costs six dollars and is produced in the excellent style and format we expect from these publications. There are forty plates, and two chapters giving an account of the excavations and of the pottery by J. L. Kelso and D. C. Baramki, one on the masonry and plaster by J. L. Kelso, one on the excavations at Khirbet En-Nitla by D. C. Baramki, a chapter on the small amount of inscriptional material by A. Jeffrey and W. F. Albright, and a final chapter by G. U. Wolf showing that Khirbet En-Nitla is not the Byzantine Gilgal.

The excavators found sherds, but no buildings, of the Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Ages, but ample Hellenistic remains and typical Herodian masonry. The site appears to have been unoccupied from the end of the third to the beginning of the eighth century A.D. Many details are given of the luxurious winter capital of Herod, with its spectacular structures and views, its beautiful gardens with fish ponds, swimming pools and fountains, and the villas, in one of which Jesus was entertained by Zacchaeus. There are hints, too, that further excavations may provide links with the Qumran and Murabba'at remains.

We have received two well illustrated volumes, price 12s. 6d. net each, published for the Church Assembly Children's Council by the Church Information Board, London. They make up one work entitled *Through the Ages : The Story of the Christian Church.* The author, the late Rev. Francis E. Barker, M.A., was a scholarly country clergyman with a gift for teaching. The primary purpose of this work was the provision of helps for the teachers of older girls and boys ; but, in fact, it gives us a picture of the Christian Church from the beginning till now with the Church of England as the guiding thread of interest throughout. At the end of each volume there are questions based on the contents of the chapters.

This is popular Church History of the best kind. It is scholarly yet interesting, with a real sense of the wholeness of the story and yet much detail. When the field is so vast it is inevitable that the presentation should be highly selective ; but the bibliography shows the width of the author's knowledge, and this can be said for him, that he is never dull. We wish him a multitude of readers.

The Church of Scotland Youth Committee has issued an admirable Handbook for First Communion—*The Enterprise of Faith,* by the Rev. Innes Logan, M.A. (2s. net). The book is divided into two parts. In the first part the duties and the privileges of Church membership are most winsomely set out. The second part is a most useful anthology. There are included in it the relevant questions and answers from the Shorter Catechism, the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, some notes and advice on reading the Bible, some recommended books, and some short prayers for the use of those who are entering on and have accepted membership of the Church. This is far more than an ordinary Handbook. It is the product of wide reading and deep thinking, passed through a most cultured and mature mind, and always instinct with the spirit of true devotion. There are many things we would like to quote ; but space demands that we confine ourselves to one. Mr. Logan quotes Miss S. T. Fraser's three reasons for the existence of the Church.

' i. To bring those who do not know Him to the knowledge of God. ii. To keep worship and adoration ascending, without ceasing, to God from His children. iii. To keep alive throughout the generations the knowledge of God and the doing of His will.'

Josephus has a story that the Samaritan Temple was built by Sanballat—presumably Nehemiah's Sanballat ?—on authority from Alexander the Great. Some scholars accept Josephus' date for the building of the Temple, but suppose he was quite wrong in associating Sanballat with it. The question is examined by Professor H. H. Rowley with his customary thoroughness and fullness of bibliographical references in an article, *Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple,* in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, and published separately (Manchester University Press ; 3s. 6d. net). Professor Rowley's conclusion is that we have no means of knowing when the Samaritan Temple was

built. What will be new to most of his readers is his suggestion that the erection of the Temple may have been neither the immediate result, nor the immediate cause, of the Samaritan schism. He thinks it probable that the Temple was built some long time before the two communities finally broke off relations with one another and that the feud between them was one which only slowly developed. There are, however, indications that the breach had become irrevocable before the time of Ben Sira.

A Reason for the Hope, published by Messrs. A. R. Mowbray (7s. 6d. net), was originally circulated privately to clergy in the London area with the approval of the Bishops concerned. It was prepared as a short course of apologetics, based on the Apostles' Creed and intended to help clergy to equip their lay workers for a popular defence of the Christian faith.

Particularly valuable are the lists of books for further reading and the numerous Scriptural references. This book does not try to provide clever answers to unbelievers' questions, but it should greatly improve Christian witness when used, as it is designed to be, in a context of prayer and Bible study, whether individual or corporate.

A Bible Word-Book, compiled by Mr. Richard Tatlock, M.A., and with a Foreword by the Bishop of Croydon (Mowbray; 3s. 6d. net), is a little book no bigger than a pocket diary in form; but for the ordinary non-technical reader of the Authorized Version of the Bible it should be a book of the very greatest value. The Authorized Version is in seventeenth-century English, and this book is a kind of little dictionary in which the meaning of unusual words is given, the meaning of obsolete words explained, and the unusual uses of words elucidated. Not so many people could say off-hand, for instance, what *neesing* (Job 41^8), *ossifrage* (Lev 11^{13}), *pommel* (2 Ch 4^{12}), *pygarg* (Dt 14^5) mean. This little book will explain these and a host of other strange, unusual and obsolete words. Any reader of the Authorized Version will find this an extremely useful volume to keep beside him, and there is not a little interest and profit to be derived in turning over the pages of it.

Achievement and Responsibility is the Study Handbook for 1956 issued by the National Adult Sunday School Union (paper 3s. 6d., cloth boards 4s. 6d. net). It deals with such varied subjects as Living Longer, Canada—Land of Promise, Trades Unions, Leaders of European Culture. Among the Biblical subjects treated are The Idea of God in the Old Testament, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, and The Thought and Work of Jesus Christ.

There is first-rate matter here both for study and for discussion.

Readers of the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D.D., will know what to expect in *Studies in the Prophecy of Jeremiah* (Oliphants; 12s. 6d. net). In one sense Dr. Campbell Morgan was a masterly interpreter of Scripture; but his interpretations are always based on Scripture alone, and little or no attempt is made to illumine the interpretation by means of the material which archæological and linguistic and historical researches can supply. This is not meant so much to be a criticism as a statement of fact.

Dr. Campbell Morgan was often master of the telling phrase and of the thought which another preacher can expand. In writing on 'Substitutes for God' on the text Jer 10^{11}, he writes: 'When men have lost the vision of God, they have not lost the necessity for God; and they must create a God of some kind, if they have lost the God who created them.'

A great deal of diligent and scholarly work has gone to the making of *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, by Dr. Bernard Ramm, B.D., M.A. (Paternoster Press; 12s. 6d. net). The author is pessimistic as to the outcome of the conflict between religion and science, distributing the blame of misunderstanding fairly evenly between the two, but makes many useful suggestions as to the resolution of the disagreement. He is severe as to the contempt for science shown by the hyper-orthodox theologians and very sarcastic about some of their attempts at literalistic interpretation, and he himself has studied with profit much recent, although not very recent, science. He is, however, handicapped in an all-out effort towards reconciliation by certain presuppositions inherited by him from fundamentalism, and weakens his positive liberal conclusions by rather unsuccessful attempts to interpret dogmatic statements (with which he himself is not in full accord) in such a way as to bring them into greater harmony with science. His criticism of scientific theory is on the whole moderate and sane, and his own theory is that the Bible is in relation to the culture of the times popular and not scientific, that it suggests the limitations of science rather than pathways for it, and that in particular evolution is a mediate and not an ultimate conception, less valuable in dealing with the cosmic situation than is the theory of progressive creationism. An intriguing suggestion, illustrative of his conception of the 'pictorial day' of Genesis, and capable of expansion in accordance with the tendency of the book as a whole is that 'creation was *revealed* in six days, not *performed* in six days.'

Contemporary Religious Trends

Industrial Evangelism

By the Reverend Dr. A. Skevington Wood, Paisley

'We have to confess with deep penitence,' admits the World Council of Churches' statement on *The Calling of the Church to Mission and Unity*, 'that the normal life of our churches does *not* express the truth that to be a Christian is necessarily to be involved in a mission to the whole world. The average congregation is apt to be an introverted community which does not think primarily of its obligation to bring the knowledge of Christ to its whole neighbourhood and to the whole world, and this introversion is apt to mark the life, thought, and leadership of the whole Church. . . . *We are led to believe that God is forcing His Church to come out into the open and commit itself afresh in a dynamic encounter with the world.*' [1]

Nowhere is such an advance to the frontier more urgently demanded than in the sphere of industry. In a very real sense the crucial Christian struggle to-day is for the soul of the proletariat. Since the Industrial Revolution the Church has lost its grip upon the working class. When Britain began to change and expand so rapidly in the eighteenth century, the Church remained largely immobile and unadaptable. 'At the beginning of the Industrial Revolution,' wrote the Hammonds in *The Town Labourer*, 'the Established Church hardly counted in the spiritual life of the districts where mines and factories began to collect these vast populations. In most of the places that were turned from rural solitudes into mining camps or textile towns, the Church scarcely existed for the poor except as the most unrelenting of the forces of law and order.' [2] Despite the enlightened convictions and commendable efforts of a Wesley, a Shaftesbury, a Maurice, the great gulf fixed tended to widen throughout the nineteenth century and has presented our generation with its major problem and challenge in evangelism. 'The parish and proletarian worlds are not merely separated,' affirmed the Abbé Godin, 'they are also utterly different.' [3]

If the Church is to discharge 'the perplexing obligation' [4] of evangelism in this most critical of all fields, the factory must become the focus and the forum. It is plain that the worker will not come to the Church—it has been estimated that only seven per cent of factory employees in Great Britain attend any place of worship. The Church, then, must go to the worker, and that involves identification at the deepest level. 'One cannot baptize a civilization,' says Père Boideffre, 'if one does not stand in the midst of it.' [5] We dare not ignore the conviction voiced at the First British Conference on Factory Evangelism, held at High Leigh in 1954, that 'the factory presents a missionary opportunity of the first magnitude and that no greater single challenge faces the Church in this land than the evangelization of the masses in industry.' [6]

How, then, is the contemporary Church seeking to meet this urgent situation? What are the principal methods of industrial evangelism? It must be remembered that this type of approach is comparatively new. Only in the last decade has the Church seriously experimented on any considerable scale. The venture is still in the pioneer stage. We cannot yet expect elaborate plans or tested techniques. In any case, we shall entertain a healthy suspicion of technique *per se*. In his invaluable manual on *The Practice of Evangelism*, Canon Bryan S. W. Green issues a wise warning on this very point. 'I am sure we shall approach any study of methods of evangelism from a false standpoint unless we realize from the outset that many methods have been born out of the travail of a soul. Any picture of a group of Christians sitting calmly down to draw up a blue-print for evangelism gives an entirely wrong impression. . . . Rather we must picture Christians thinking, praying and struggling to find a way, and out of that spiritual experience is discovered either some fresh approach to those they seek to win or an adaptation of some well-tried method which is baptized afresh by the Spirit Who is guiding them.' [7]

We propose to examine first two experiments which assume that the ordained minister is the chief agent of industrial mission.

(1) *The Factory Chaplain*

The kind of enterprise described by Canon Moore Darling in the January issue of *The*

[1] *Ecumenical Studies*, 2A: *Evangelism*, 4.
[2] P. 272.
[3] *France Pagan?*, ed. Maisie Ward, 97.
[4] *Ecumenical Studies*, 2A: *Evangelism*, 3.
[5] *Combat*, January 1, 1954.
[6] *Industrial Evangelism*, ed. C. A. Roberts, and E. Rogers, 1.
[7] P. 177.

Expository Times[1] is becoming increasingly common. The Church of Scotland has been the principal pathfinder, for the Home Board Industrial Chaplaincy scheme was inaugurated as far back as 1943. There are now over three hundred factory chaplains in Scotland—probably the largest number in any country in the world, so it is claimed. This particular approach arises from the assumption that if it is deemed essential to send clergy as padres into the Armed Forces of the Crown, it is equally vital to care for the same men when they exchange their uniform for overalls. It would, of course, be impracticable to appoint full-time industrial chaplains, but the work has been most admirably carried forward on a part-time basis by local ministers.

Experience has shown that certain factors contribute to the effectiveness of this form of evangelism.

(*a*) The chaplain must go into the factory with a transparently genuine desire to reflect the Church's concern, purged of all ulterior motives (particularly those related to the building up of his own congregation).

(*b*) He must secure the blessing not only of the management, but also of the Shop Stewards' Committee, otherwise he will be branded as a 'governor's man' whose purpose is to boost morale in the interests of higher productivity.

(*c*) He must really mix with the men and not just deliver an occasional 'pep' talk in the canteen.

(*d*) He must always be prepared to answer honest questions concerning the faith, and not retreat into a dogmatic coward's castle.

(*e*) He must be easily and regularly available for personal consultation.

(*f*) He must be ready to undertake pastoral visitation in the homes of employees in times of sickness, death, or any other trouble.

(*g*) He must take the same gospel to the directors' lunch table as he proclaims in the staff canteen.

It will be seen that much of the factory chaplain's work is pre-evangelistic. That is inevitable. 'The years that the locust hath eaten' cannot be restored overnight. The way of the Lord has to be prepared by unspectacular spade-work. But, perhaps, after many months or even years of such arduous toil, the time may be ripe for a factory mission on Christian Commando lines.

(2) *The Priest-Workman*

One of the most notable experiments in industrial evangelism in recent years had its origin in France. During the Second World War, Henri Perrin and other priests went to work in Germany as ordinary engineers because the Nazi authorities would not permit official chaplains for imported Frenchmen.[2] Then, in 1944, the priest-workman was adopted as an integral part of the Mission de France, stimulated by the Abbé Godin. The first was a docker in Marseilles. Eventually there were about two hundred of them. They shared to the full the lot of the proletariat, both in their living and working conditions. Their evangelism was carried on at the workshop-bench and their homes were used as New Testament house churches. Unfortunately, as Leo Zander has put it, 'the heroic venture proved too big, too radical, and official Christianity too cautious. But the fact that the attempt was ever made, that the priest-workers worked for ten whole years, is a lasting glory for French Catholicism. . . . The Catholic Church in France had to bow beneath the iron hand of the Roman Curia. But the *whole* Church should remember that the besieged lasted out for ten years and only halted on the precipice of open revolt against Rome.'[3]

Similar experiments, on a much smaller scale, have been made in Britain. The story of one of them has been told anonymously in the book *Priest-Workman in England*. During the War years his mind was moving along the same lines as the French, although quite independently. Under Divine guidance he was led to find employment in industry for a period of years and to exercise his vocation to the Christian ministry there. The record is one which cannot be overlooked by any who are concerned with industrial evangelism.

There would, however, appear to be insuperable difficulties in the way of any widespread adoption of this method of evangelism in Britain. The present ministerial man-power shortage and the vast number of factories over the country would militate against it.[4] The link with the local church would probably need to be much closer than in the French venture. But the most decisive factor—and this also weighs to a certain extent against the factory chaplain—is that it tends to create a false distinction between the clergy and the laity and suggests that industrial evangelism can only be successfully carried out by the ordained ministry.

[1] lxvii. 115–117.

[2] Père Rutter had actually worked in a Belgian coal mine for several years before 1939; cf. Leo Zander, 'The Tragedy of the Priest-Workmen in France,' in *Church Quarterly Review* [July-September, 1955], 284.

[3] *Ib.*, 287–288.

[4] According to the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories in 1952, there were then 234,200 factories in England, Scotland and Wales, employing 7,352,000 workers.

That leads to the third and most important consideration.

(3) *The Lay Cell*

The call to industrial evangelism is primarily a challenge to the Christian laymen in our public works. Too often we assume that the Church can only visit the factory in the person of the minister. But the Church is already there. The leaven is in the lump. And seven per cent is a relatively high proportion of yeast in the loaf and can exercise a surprisingly disruptive and pervasive influence.

As Canon L. John Collins has shown in his pamphlet on *The Part of the Laity in Evangelism*, the evangelistic method of our Lord Jesus Christ was to concentrate on the training of the Twelve to be the leaders of what to-day we should call a Christian cell. ' The method of Jesus was to work chiefly through the few to the many. He created and developed an Apostolic circle to be, after His death and Resurrection, the organic hub (with Himself as centre) of a live Christian community which should be the means of revolutionizing all previous forms of religious and secular thought and action.' [1]

The setting up of such a cell of Christian ' militants,' as Canon Michonneau calls them, within a factory would appear to be the most likely form of industrial evangelism to-day—but not, of course, to the exclusion of others. It is significant that the Second Conference on Factory Evangelism at Blackpool last year moved away from the idea of full-time factory chaplains and strongly veered towards the formation of an industrial order of Christian laymen to function alongside a recognized order of part-time chaplains.[2] In their several ways the Industrial Christian Fellowship, the Scottish Christian Industrial Order, the Young Christian Workers, and the Workers' Christian Fellowship all seek to fulfil this purpose.

This is the most *effective* form of industrial evangelism. It is the considered opinion of one of Britain's most experienced investigators in this field, William Gowland, that ' Christian laymen have a greater opportunity of bringing their friends from the shop floor and through the Church porch into the pew than any industrial chaplain can ever have. A demonstration by laymen in industry of the relevance of the Christian faith to the life of the world and the personal needs of men is a far more decisive factor in making relevant the Christian faith to the non-churchgoer than the work of any padre.' [3]

This is the most *demanding* form of industrial evangelism. It requires an unreserved committal to the Christian way on the part of laymen. So many good Church members are candid enough to confess that if they were to engage in such a witness at their work, they would need to re-organize their manner of life in accordance with the ethical standard of Christ. Moreover, those enrolled in such Christian cells would need initial training. It is not enough that a man should maintain the integrity of his character in the factory. He must also know how to translate the gospel into economic and industrial terms. It was the late Archbishop Temple who insisted that Christianity was the most materialistic religion in the world since it was based on the Incarnation. The fundamentals of this Christian materialism must be grasped by the lay evangelist in industry if he is to commend his faith to others.

This is the most *hopeful* form of industrial evangelism. It is adapted to the temper of our age. That is what Canon Michonneau has seen so clearly and expressed so convincingly. Dealing with the mission to the proletariat through the medium of the Christian cell, he writes : ' Only a small percentage is capable of individual thought, and it is these who discuss and reflect on social and religious questions. The others, the great majority, are not aware of any personal capabilities along such lines ; they are submerged in the vague " personality " of the group to which they belong. They think as a unit and subscribe only to those ideas which their group holds, whether that group is their Union, their fellow-workers, their political party or their friends. Hence it is impossible to draw them to Christ as individuals. Either the whole group goes over to Him, or no one does. The conquest must be a collective one. That does not mean a conquest of the entire working class (which " class " is an entity, but not a reality) but of *this* group, of *this* portion here and now.' [4]

When confronted and often overawed by the vastness of the task, the realization that it is by the conquest of ' *this* group,' ' *this* portion ' brings with it a new hopefulness. But it is also ' here and now.' We must begin where we are and we must not delay. The King's business requireth haste. No aspect of evangelism is more challenging than this, but none could be more rewarding in its issue.

[1] P. 4f.
[2] *Industrial Evangelism*, 12.
[3] *Militant and Triumphant*, 37–38.
[4] *Revolution in a City Parish*, 7.

Reflections on Bultmann's Hermeneutic—II

By Professor H. Thielicke, D.D., University of Hamburg

Translated from the German by the Reverend John Macquarrie, B.D., Ph.D., Glasgow

Here we come up against the problem of what Bultmann calls 'the hermeneutic principle.'

Our best way to begin is with the question whether in general there can be such a thing as a hermeneutic principle. Would not such a criterion of analysis, with the power of something which was a law unto itself, change over from the subservient function of a *usus organicus* to that of a *usus normativus* in which it dominated the text? To express myself somewhat pointedly, I could say: I always know what the text will say to me or even what it can say to me, because I can already infer it from the hermeneutic principle lying at my disposal.

Will this difficulty not remain even if the hermeneutic criterion, like the *Materialprinzip* of the Reformation, is taken out of the text itself? Will the text in its fullness not always be narrowed again by it, or will the hermeneutic criteria not always be themselves put in question again, and forced to correct themselves?

I myself incline to the view that there just is not a hermeneutic 'principle' in the narrow sense, but that there can be such a principle only in a heuristic or *interim* form. In order to understand a text, I must, of course, have a definitely oriented question, or better, a point of view, under which I first consider the text. In this there lies a certain analogy with an experiment in natural science which likewise is carried out to begin with on the ground of certain definite assumptions. But we must be prepared to correct these assumptions in the light of the result of the experiment. Thus it is a thoroughly warranted procedure to interpret the Old Testament, in Luther's sense, from the point of view whether and how far it is concerned with Christ. But supposing it turns out that certain parts of the Old Testament are not elucidated in this way, then the interpreter must be ready, having regard to the text itself, to shift his hermeneutic point of view, and to provide himself with a new point of view for his understanding. That is what I meant when I said that a hermeneutic principle is not something given that is fixed and unalterable (and that applies equally whether I have imported it into the text or derived it from the text), but that we are concerned here with a permanently variable quantity, and one ready for variation.

As a further point of criticism which, as it seems to me, must fairly be made, there is the fact that what Bultmann calls his hermeneutic principle has an astonishing kinship with the categories of thought belonging to the Enlightenment. I am thinking especially of Semmler and Lessing.

For the former the *kerygma* is an X which cannot be fixed, and which can only be had within the accommodation of those to whom it is addressed. That means: not only the *kerygma* is historical but also its interpretation is historical. It is tied to the situation of the interpreter. The hermeneutic principle appears here also, and of such a kind that the orthodox doctrine of inspiration could not yield it. In this connexion the question had to arise in Semmler—as also in Lessing—of the orientation in which the Biblical texts are to be interpreted. And the answer is clear, if I may somewhat simplify it (in Semmler it is indeed complicated). This orientation is the hidden truth of reason in the text. In the terminology of Marburg one might say: The hidden self-understanding of the author in the text. To which one would add, completely in the manner of Lessing, that this self-understanding requires to be released by the 'directed impetus' which comes from the side of the revelation, and that thus the self-understanding in the sense of the truth of reason rests likewise, as in Bultmann, in a certain sense on the historical.

Admittedly, it must at once be added that the content of self-understanding is *differently* understood in Marburg and Wolfenbüttel [1]—or should I rather say, is supposed to be differently understood?

Bultmann does not wish any self-sufficient truth of reason as the content of self-understanding, such as Lessing wished. But possibly that does not depend upon the fact that in Bultmann self-understanding—as distinct from Lessing's truth of reason—always remains *tied to the historical*, that through the 'truth of history' (Lessing) belonging to the *kerygma* it would be set permanently in

[1] Marburg and Wolfenbüttel: Professor Thielicke is here implying a comparison between the existentialist and rationalist points of view. Bultmann, of course, is Professor Emeritus of New Testament in Marburg. Lessing was Librarian at Wolfenbüttel, where he edited in 1777 the famous *Wolfenbüttelsche Fragmente*, a rationalist attack on orthodox Christianity.

order. This remaining appearance of historicity, to which Bultmann's thought adheres, is in my opinion occasioned by the fact that on the plane of thought of existential philosophy, on which Bultmann moves, the thought of the truth of reason is just not possible. On the plane of the philosophy of existence (as, for example, in Heidegger, Jaspers, Marcel, and even Sartre) truth is always truth that is released, truth that is becoming free in a situation. For this reason truth is always historical. Set free through situations and human beings, it is there only in the ' moment.' It is, in any case, never timeless, never on the other side of the moment. In *this* sense to be sure truth in Bultmann also is really historical, set free by the *kerygma* and in the continuing dialogue with the *kerygma*.

On account of this it *appears* as if faith and understanding in Bultmann depended for their constitution on the history of Christ, whereas in reality it is the case that the *kerygma* in releasing *existentiell* truth possesses fundamentally no different rank from any other way of encounter which lays a claim on me and releases truth in me. Thus I would certainly suppose (as *against* Bultmann) that the kinship between Marburg and Wolfenbüttel is even greater than it seems at first sight, if one remembers that the *apparent* difference is largely to be referred only to the different modes of expression, namely, in the one case a rationalist expression, and in the other case the expression of the existential thought-schema.

When all that has been said, I may collect the decisive questions which we would have to put to Bultmann as follows :

(1) Can historic facticity be predicated only of an event if it can be shown to have really happened by means of historical research, or if at any rate in principle it can be designated as lying on the plane of that which is historically determinable ? Such a demonstration or such a concession is then in any case impossible in principle, as far as the major events of the New Testament are concerned, if the criteria for historic truth are understood in the sense in which Ernst Troeltsch understood them (causality, immanence, analogy). Since in Bultmann it is only that which occurs within the world that is treated as historic, he also lays claim, though without explicitly saying so, to these criteria of Troeltsch. As judged by these criteria then the events from Christmas to Whitsunday—to name only the most decisive—are indeed *no* historic facts. There is however still the question whether the reports about those events can therefore be regarded as basically myths or legends, or whether one should not rather, in the reverse order, furnish from these events the concept of what history in the strict and *authentic* sense is. Is there not also active in these determinations of Bultmann a preliminary understanding of what history can only be, and does this knowledge not now act as the norm over against everything which makes the claim to be historical, instead of being itself ready to allow its presupposed *schemata* to be shattered by certain contents of history ? (See quotation from Bultmann, The Expository Times, Feb., p.156.) Is it thus not necessary that the preunderstanding of that which alone can deserve the predicate ' historical ' should be subject to constant revision and to constant variation, just like the hermeneutic principle ?

(2) Can a sentence of the *kerygma* really only be regarded as theologically obligatory if it can be shown to be a possible self-understanding of Christian existence ? To that we must say : It is true that all the facts of the Biblical *Heilgeschichte* as they are recounted in the apostolic record have an affinity to human existence. They are all ' aimed ' upon this. They can never be treated theologically therefore as they are ' in themselves,' but they become the subject-matter for theology only because they are understood as the history of God towards and with mankind. But in this connexion it is to be stressed that it concerns primarily and permanently a history *towards* man (*iustitia aliena*) and only derivatively a history *in* man. Just as certainly as the distinction between Christ's Person and His Work in the sense of something ' in itself ' and something ' for me ' which is carried out within the ontological *schema* of thought cannot be maintained, just as little can this distinction in principle be omitted. For it is intended to maintain the Person of Christ as standing over against the person of mankind and thus to preserve it from the misunderstanding that it can become the mere ' object ' of the Christian's religious self-consciousness. In that way, as Barth once said, the *kerygma* would be reduced ' to sentences about the inner life of mankind.' Since Bultmann is of opinion that the *kerygma* is only given if it can become the content of a possible self-understanding, he undertakes that reduction, and considers that a ' theological ' expression is only given when it can become a possible anthropology, admittedly an anthropology which is quite definitely *qualified*. But there takes place in the fact of the *Heilgeschichte* more in ' heaven ' and thus *extra me* than in the mind which fashions the self-understanding. Concerning this distinction between the *extra me* and the *intra me*, which we illustrated from the Person and work of Christ, compare the exactly worded expressions about the Holy Spirit as Person and work in the Confessions of Augustine. Clearly Bultmann's thinking here stands in the tradition of *Bewusstseinstheologie* (Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Herrmann).

(3) We still have to inquire exactly into Bult-

mann's concept of myth,[1] more especially with regard to the question how far he has been influenced by the Hegelians, or left-wing Hegelians (D. F. Strauss). But, above all, it seems to me necessary to make a distinction which unhappily does not appear in Bultmann. This is the distinction between (*a*) myth as an ideological *kerygma* possessing a quite definite outlook as its content, one might say, a world-view. A typical example would be the cyclic concept of time which appears in many myths, and implies a pessimistic *kerygma*. Here 'world-view' does not mean a definite cosmology, but I understand under the term the whole complex of ontological and normative expressions as they are found in a total self-understanding, interpreting the meaning of being and the meaning of man's being.

From this total tendency in myth towards a world-view, and so from the *kerygma* of myth, we must distinguish (*b*) what I would like to call 'the single elements of mythical picture-language.' It could well be that the Old and New Testaments took over as means of expression these single elements from the religious and historical environment—just in the same way as abstract concepts, for example, the *logos* concept, were simply taken over through the vehicle of language. But in the Bible these single elements have been divested of their ideological and mythical significance. I have allowed myself to state that scarcely one of the sayings of Jesus that have been handed down does not already occur in the Rabbinical discourses. And yet these sayings within the Gospels have become quite differently qualified, and have become a *new kerygma*. It could be similar with the mythical elements. But then we would be given the task of showing how far the Old and New Testaments themselves have already carried out real acts of demythologizing, so far as one understands by demythologizing the freeing of the myths from the *kerygma* which they *contained*. Then admittedly, with regard to Bultmann's analysis, we should be confronted with the problems expounded under (1) and (2), and would have to show what relation subsists between the mythical picture *elements* and the historical facts; or whether and how far Bultmann, through his concept of *history*—and not primarily through that of myth!—finds himself not in a position to conceive the presence of transcendence in immanence (incarnation), and that he must understand *concerning it* that it is an illegitimate objectivizing of God, a myth. For he conceives as myth the objectivizing of supranatural *data*, above all, the objectivizing of God in the sense of His entering into that which occurs. To that extent Bultmann must understand by 'demythologizing,' both as it is carried out in the New Testament and as he himself speaks of it, something other than *we* have designated by this term in the preceding sentences.

[1] Professor Thielicke's argument in this concluding section is somewhat compressed. We must be careful to note how his terminology differs from that of Professor Bultmann. '*Kerygma*,' for Bultmann, means the Biblical proclamation which can be disentangled, he thinks, from myth, and interpreted as an existential self-understanding. Thielicke uses the term '*kerygma*' in a much wider sense. For him it includes a world-view as well as a self-understanding, and he extends the term to cover non-Biblical interpretations of existence, so that he can speak of a pessimistic *kerygma* or a pantheistic *kerygma* as the content of some pagan myths. Correspondingly, these two scholars hold entirely different notions of what is meant by 'demythologizing,' and Professor Thielicke makes this difference quite clear in his last paragraph.

Contributions and Comments

'Lead us not into temptation'

In 'Notes of Recent Exposition' in The Expository Times for December, 1955, mention is made of the article on 'Man's Need of God' by the Right Rev. G. F. Allan, M.A., in *The Modern Churchman*, September, 1955, in which he suggests that the petition, 'Lead us not into temptation' means that we be kept from tempting God. I do not see how this view can be accepted. It is true that we have in the Bible the idea of testing God or putting Him to the proof, and that we find this translated into the English word *tempt*. But when we read of tempting or testing we should surely understand this in the sense of the tempting of man, unless the context clearly shows that it is the tempting of God that is meant. Besides, it is as difficult to think of God leading us into tempting Himself as of His leading us into temptation by evil.

It is well known that some have thought that the reference is to the world-tribulation which was expected to precede the consummation of all things. In this case the word *evil* stands for calamity rather

than for moral evil. But as our Lord's ethical teaching does not seem to me to be specially designed for a short interval before the last things I cannot think that His teaching on prayer was so designed.

For myself I accept the suggestion of E. A. Abbott in *The Son of Man* [1910; p. 657 f.] that the words, 'lead us not into temptation' represent such a Hebrew phrase as נתן בְּיַד 'give into the hand of,' 'into the power of,' 'deliver over to.' Why may not the petition represent some such Hebrew or Aramaic words meaning, 'Lead us not,' or 'Bring us not,' or 'Let us not fall,' into the hand (the power) of temptation? We get such phraseology in the Revised Standard Version of Is 64^7: 'Thou hast hid thy face from us, and hast delivered us into the hand of our iniquities.' When Jesus says to the disciples in Gethsemane, 'Watch and pray, that you may not enter into temptation,' the meaning seems to be not that they might not be tempted, for this could not be prevented, but that they might not enter into the power of temptation, which is what I take to be meant in 'The Lord's Prayer.' In this case the evil intended is moral evil. We must distinguish between being brought to or into contact with temptation and being brought into, that is, into the hands of, temptation. It is the latter from which Jesus bids us pray that we may be saved.

As for the difficulty of God leading us into the power of evil, we have to remember that in Scripture all events are ultimately determined by God, for without His will, at least, to allow them, none of them would take place.

In this interpretation the second part of the request is parallel to the first, the first part putting the matter negatively, 'Lead us not into the power of temptation,' and the second part putting it positively, 'Deliver us from evil.' And the Hebrew practice of parallelism strengthens our interpretation, since yielding to temptation is a better parallel to evil than temptation.

It makes no difference to the essential sense whether we think of evil in the abstract or of a personal Evil One.

W. Powell

Twickenham, Middlesex

Note on the Three 'Pillars' (Galatians ii. 9)

It appears that Paul was here making a joke which commentators have missed. Wherever the Romans took their civilization, they made race-courses and stadia; and Paul was referring here to the three turning-posts or 'markers' which stood close together at both ends of the long low wall, built out in the centre of the arena, around which chariots or runners raced. These turning-posts (called Metae) were three tall wooden cylinders of a conical shape, like cypress trees or huge old-fashioned candles.[1]

This reference to racing would have been obvious to the people to whom Paul wrote because he had just told them that he had gone to the three Jerusalem leaders—('the Markers')—to recite his gospel message to them to make sure that he was not 'running on the wrong track' (Gal 2^2).

And Paul returns to the metaphor of the stadium yet again later in the Letter when he says: 'You were racing splendidly. Who then fouled you . . . ?' (Gal 5^7).

This explanation of the 'Pillars' throws quite a new light on the importance of 'James, Cephas and John.' They were not, as we have hitherto believed, just the three bulwarks of the Mother Church (though no doubt they were that as well). The way in which Paul refers to them makes it clear that as early as the Forties these men were the three guardians of the Tradition and censors of the Kerygma. This is important new evidence on the History of Christian Origins.

A minor point remains. The commoner Greek word for the turning-posts was *stēlai*. *Stuloi* (the word used here for 'Pillars') may, I suggest, be a playful pun on *Apostoloi* (Apostles).

Rupert Annand

Bath

Luke xiii. 25

The householder's reply '*Οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, πόθεν ἐστέ*' appears very clumsy. Would it not be better to change the usual punctuation to make it read '*Οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς. πόθεν ἐστέ*'? This would then give a perfectly good reason for the householder not opening his door. It would also lead logically to *vv.* 26, 27.

E. Brian Packett

Stoke-on-Trent

[1] See illustration from the British Museum in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 284.

Christ's Challenge to Straight Thinking

By the Reverend John Baker, B.A., B.D., Wylde Green, Sutton Coldfield

AMILIAR as we are with Christ's teaching, it not always easy for us to realize how great as the impact of His thought upon contemporary eas and conventions. While it is true that ose who are versed in the Rabbinic background the Gospels keep reminding us of certain rallels to Christ's teachings in Jewish thought, hat they tell us does little to explain the shock hich Christ's ministry of word and deed gave the learned authorities of the nation.

It has been argued by some that it was not so uch the content as the *manner* of Christ's inistry that caused offence—His assumption of uthority, His Messianic claims, and His appeal the easily roused, ignorant, common people. his is an issue on which we must take sides in ccordance with our view of Christ's Person, and many the content and manner of Christ's inistry are so interdependent that one cannot e understood without the other. If we believe hrist to be the Son of God, then many of His tterances have a far deeper meaning than if e were only a prophet. Many of His parables ke on a startling significance when it is realized hat the central figure in the story is the One ho is speaking.

There is one aspect of Christ's ministry which as not, we believe, received sufficient attention—nd it concerns both His manner, and the content f His teaching—namely, His deliberate policy f driving men back to the point of self-examina-on, beyond their conventional attitudes, beyond eir prejudices and their proneness to deceive emselves and to make excuses for their ehaviour. As we read the Gospels we come cross one incident after the other where Christ trying to get His hearers to be honest with emselves, so that their lives may begin anew.

Even a cursory reading of the Gospels makes obvious that this attempt to straighten out eople's thinking was deliberate. The example earest to hand is the Sermon on the Mount. hroughout this collection of Christ's sayings we nd a recurring motif—the injunction to re-think ch of the subjects with which He deals—murder, ultery, almsgiving, oaths, prayer, forgiveness, mple offerings, love and hate as duties, etc. n each point Christ puts the emphasis where it as rarely put—upon the inner thought and otive preceding the action.

With this deliberate correction of prevailing eas we are familiar, not only in the Sermon on the Mount but in many other parts of the Gospels, for example in those incidents of Sabbath healing, or so-called breaking of the Sabbath. After each incident Christ tries to use the shock caused by His behaviour as a wedge for forcing into the minds of His hearers a much richer conception of the Sabbath. They are guilty, He points out, of lack of thought, of failure to draw the right conclusions in their estimate of the purpose of the Sabbath. So in Mk 3^5 we read that He was 'grieved for the hardness of their hearts,' or as the margin rightly interprets this last phrase, 'blindness.' We might call it unwillingness to think below the surface of the obvious or conventional.

The Gospels are full of this challenge to wrong thinking. In Mk 7 His reference to the washing of cups, while there is uncleanness within, is a strong protest. And in another place, in commenting upon men's ability to read the weather-signs while being blind to the spiritual signs of the times, He adds the stringent query, '*οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον*'; 'Why judge ye not what is right?' Or, as we might say to-day, 'Why can't you see straight?' (Lk 12^{57}).

Occasionally it seems as though He was so determined to attack the loose thinking of His age that He broke a quite good rule in order to make men stop and think. This seems to be so in the incident recorded at Lk 11^{38} where the Pharisee 'marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner.' It is quite likely that Christ did this on purpose, to get across to those around Him the subsequent teaching on the inconsistency of tithing the small herbs, and passing over judgment and the love of God.

Throughout His ministry we find this stress on honesty of thought in facing all issues. Jesus called no one to follow Him under false pretences: He warned the disciples of the difficulties that lay before them. He gave them no theories to swallow whole—He lived with them, so that they could thoroughly examine His claims. Christ preached consistency between what men profess and how they live. He also faced awkward questions such as those recorded in Lk 13^{1ff} concerning the tragedies that befell innocent men. In His whole attitude towards truth we are constantly reminded of man's duty to *think* as well as to obey.

It is not necessary to labour the point further. But there is one aspect of this matter which calls

for consideration, namely, Christ's exposures, not only of the blatant hypocrisy of the scribes and Pharisees, which is so obvious, but of the more subtle self-deceit which could affect men of every group.

How inexorably did Christ unveil the hidden motives of men when they came to Him with their requests! One striking example of this is the man from the crowd who approached Christ with a plea for His judgment on the matter of an inheritance, when he felt that his brother had wronged him. Jesus saw through the man, and drove him back beyond the legal issue to the personal question of covetousness, which was the real cause of his dissatisfaction.

The most thorough exposure, however, of this proneness of men to excuse themselves is seen in two parables in Luke, and a brief examination of these will reveal how important Christ regarded the need to think honestly.

The first occurs in Lk 14^{15-24}. The occasion is the spontaneous exclamation of one of the company who was so impressed by Christ's teaching that he blurted out, 'Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.'

We can almost feel the silence that followed these words, as all eyes were turned towards Jesus, waiting for His comment. It came in the form of a parable of three men who gladly accepted an invitation to a great supper, but when the time came, all three excused themselves for different reasons, leaving their places to be filled with the riff-raff who had been dragged in from the highways and byways.

The meaning of this parable lies in the words of the man, and the religious sentiment behind them. How often had Christ heard similar pious longings expressed? How many prayers for the coming of the Kingdom had He listened to? Enough to make Him realize that most of those who longed for the Kingdom were totally unfit in spirit for the life of that Kingdom. Their longing was superficial, sentimental, and spurious, because they would never be willing to accept the conditions of God's rule. Indeed, they would angrily reject God when they realized how much they would have to renounce of their worldly goods and pleasures.

Had any one asked any of the people to whom Christ spoke if they would rejoice at the coming of the Kingdom, they would all have replied, 'Yes, how wonderful it would be!' And each would hope to find a place in that Kingdom. That was the popular belief and longing of the time. Yet when Jesus had preached the Kingdom, and sought to get them to accept the kind of life which God required, He had met with scant response.

The parable unveils the dishonesty of popular thinking. The three men gladly accepted the invitation to the supper—which is really the 'Kingdom Feast,' the Supper which will inaugurate the new Kingdom. But when the invitation becomes, instead of a vague dream, a challenging reality, things change. One man has bought a piece of ground, and must inspect it. That is the most urgent thing in his life at the moment—his livelihood, and he is blind to all else. The second has bought five yoke of oxen, and must lose no time in examining them, lest he be cheated. Business must come first. The third has a ready-made excuse. Having been married within the year he is still free from all other responsibilities, according to Jewish custom—and he likes his freedom. He does not wish to be bothered by serious matters just now.

In fact, all three are satisfied with life as it is, and they do not wish to change it. If things kept on as they were they could very well do without the Kingdom.

The parable is an exposure of religious hopes and dreams which are unconnected with the ethical demands which will alone make these hopes possible of realization. How easy it is to 'believe' that the Kingdom will come, and to pray for its coming—and at the same time to make no attempt to *help* its coming, to turn a deaf ear to the voice of every prophet, and even to the voice of the Lord of the Kingdom, when He calls! Jesus would have His hearers examine their hopes, and see whether they did not need to straighten out their thinking.

The second parable which strikes this emphatic note is that of Dives and Lazarus (Lk 16^{19-31}). This, surely, is one of the most cutting of Christ's utterances. It is full of biting sarcasm, which we must now pass over. For our purpose, the sting is at the end, in the words, 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.'

Dives had lived a life of selfish indulgence, and now found himself in torment. Since he could not himself be helped, he pleaded with Abraham that Lazarus be sent to warn his brothers of what would befall them unless they mended their ways. Abraham explained that it was surely enough for them to listen to what had been said by Moses and the prophets.

The insinuation is clear. Every Jew knows what he *should* do, since he has had to learn the words of the Law and the prophets at the synagogue school in his youth. But Dives pleads for indulgence. If only a special, miraculous sign could be given to them, then they would believe. Let Lazarus rise from the dead and startle them

o their senses ! A miracle would persuade them, where moral appeal had failed.

The final words fall bitterly from Christ's lips—If they will not listen to the moral truth of God's aw, then not even the most spectacular miracle will persuade them.

In other words, those who will not obey what hey know to be right and good, obviously have made their choice *against* it. They *do not want o be good*, and they excuse themselves by saying—If only we knew *for certain*, if only God would give us a sign ! Had they not asked Jesus for a ign, a miraculous proof ? They threw the onus f their moral choice upon God, hinting that if only He made things clearer, with signs and wonders, then it would be easier for them to live as they should, in obedience to the Law.

The parable reveals how easily, by dishonest thinking, a man may excuse himself, quieten his conscience, and contract out of his moral obligations, when the simple fact is that he does not want to be good. And when man has made his choice, no miracle will make him change it—only a change of heart in facing and accepting the claims of truth and goodness upon his will and conscience.

We have not far to go in order to find Christ's motive for this challenge to honest thinking.

He wanted to save men and women, and this He could not do until they were honest with themselves, until they stopped making excuses, and gave up their little pretences. Christ could do nothing for the man who thought he was ' righteous.' The sinners, the publicans, and the harlots were at rock bottom : they could not pretend to be other than they were, and in Christ's presence they confessed their need. These He was able to heal, to forgive, to make whole—for all their barriers were down, and they knew themselves for what they were, In Christ's presence they had fulfilled the essential condition of being honest with themselves, and upon that condition Christ was able to do His work. Without it He could do nothing for men. That was why He put such emphasis on straight thinking.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Good News Can't Wait

By the Reverend James N. S. Alexander, B.D., S.T.M., The University of Aberdeen

Last year, about this time, I heard about a minister's manse where, just as in many another house, the pipes had become frozen because of the icy weather. You know how anxious a time it is when the pipes are frozen because as often as not when the thaw comes the pipes burst and the water floods the house and makes a terrible mess. On the Sunday afternoon the minister was speaking to his Bible Class when his little boy burst through the door in a great state of happiness and excitement, ran up the aisle of the church and shouted out—*Daddy, the pipes is unfroze*. Now perhaps it was not very reverent to burst into a church like that and perhaps it was not very mannerly to interrupt his father like that when he was speaking to his Bible Class and perhaps that little boy's grammar could have been better—but that boy had the right idea : he was so happy that he had to share the reason for his happiness : he had good news, good news that couldn't wait.

On the very first Easter morning, over nineteen hundred years ago, there were two women called Mary who went to the tomb where Jesus had been buried after His death upon the Cross. They went very sadly and sorrowfully because they had loved Jesus so much and they thought they would never see Him alive again. And then what happened ? They found an angel sitting on the stone at the entrance to the tomb and the angel said to them : ' Fear not ye : for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here : for he is risen, as he said . . . And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead.' And we read that they went quickly from the sepulchre with fear and wonder and great joy and ran to tell His disciples. No wonder they *ran* ! If ever there was good news that couldn't wait this was it—the most thrilling wonderful message that there ever was to pass on.

And to-day on Easter morning we have that same great good news that ' the Saviour died but rose again triumphant o'er the grave ' ; that Jesus is alive. Just as when He was to be seen walking about the roads of Galilee He is able to-day to help boys and girls and men and women and make them like Him in all their ways.

Try to take it in, this thrilling message of Easter and when you do—pass it on : for it is good news that cannot wait.

Crazy Arithmetic

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., Th.M., Glasgow

'All may be one.'—Jn 17^{21}.

Are you good at arithmetic, boys and girls? Even if you're not very good at it you probably know the answer to this question, 'What do one and one make?' Everybody—even the little babies—know that one and one make two. Are you sure, boys and girls?

I'm not. Quite often, for instance, I take one and one—a bride and a bridegroom—and make one. When two people marry they're not separate people any more, they are just like one person. So sometimes one and one make one. Then you've all heard of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. He was only one man all the time, but by day he was the good Dr. Jekyll and by night the wicked Mr. Hyde. I've known little boys and little girls too who were certainly like two people—a good one and a bad one, a lazy and a quick one, a true and a false one, all boxed up inside one little body and called by one name. That means that sometimes one makes two or even more. Then we've all seen a crack regiment marching past us—and we've heard people say that they move 'like one man.' So sometimes one and one make one, sometimes one makes two, and sometimes many people make one! It is all very confusing.

Even here in the church where there are hundreds of us, we join all our voices in one when we sing, and sometimes when we pray together we join our hearts and souls in one too. Throughout the world there are millions and millions of Christians differing in colour and language and in their ways of worship and of speaking about God, but they are at one in this—if they are real Christians—in the love of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Remember, the next time you do arithmetic, that there are exceptions even to its rules and remember Christ's prayer for those who love Him, that 'All may be one.'

The Christian Year

Palm Sunday

The Weeping Kings

By the Late Professor D. M. Baillie, D.D., of St. Andrews

'And David went up by the ascent of the mount of Olives, and wept as he went up.'—2 S 15^{30} (R.V.).

'And when Jesus was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it.'—Lk 19^{41}.

These two pictures happened at almost exactly the same spot, though there was a thousand years between them.

There is hardly any more moving story in the Old Testament than the story of how Absalom, the prince, stole the hearts of the people away from his father, King David, and then started a great conspiracy, marching on Jerusalem to seize the throne. When David heard it, he and his faithful followers began to make a hasty trek out of the city, as the only chance of safety. And then, when the city was fairly left behind for the charming traitor to enter with his treacherous crowds, 'David went up by the ascent of the Mount of Olives, and wept as he went up.'

And then, a thousand years later, on that same spot, though riding in the other direction, was Jesus. He was surrounded by the shouts of people hailing Him with Hosanna as their King. But He saw pretty clearly that Jerusalem was going to reject Him and even kill Him. As the procession came round the bend of the road, on the shoulder of the Mount of Olives (travellers tell us about the exact spot), the wonderful beloved city came into view. And, says Luke, when Jesus saw it, He wept. Again the people saw their King in tears.

The latter scene is our Palm Sunday subject. But the other scene is so movingly like it, and yet so strikingly different from it, that it will touch our imaginations, and make us see something of the glory of Jesus as He moved on towards the Cross.

1. *Jesus wept, not for Himself, but for Jerusalem.* David, too, loved the city with a pathetic love and he, too, in that sad hour showed that in his heart there was room for thoughts of other people. There is a very noble kingly touch in the story. And even if he was most of all sorry for himself, can we wonder at that? He might well weep for himself. But Jesus wept for Jerusalem.

Of course that is entirely in line with what we find throughout that last terrible week of the Passion of Jesus, and we must see it if we are to understand His Cross at all: He went to meet it with a heart of heroic love, self-forgetting love. He was not a sorry victim, looking round for pity and breaking down emotionally among His followers.

We remember how, the very last night, when the shadow of death was on Him, He was so obviously thinking more of the disciples than of Himself. There they were, still quarrelling about the chief place; and so (John tells us) Jesus took a basin and a towel and washed their feet, so as to give them something to remember that would teach them a nobler attitude one to another. We remember how in those terrifying hours of darkness in Gethsemane He kept counselling them to watch and pray lest they should be overtaken unawares by the great ordeal. We remember how, when on His very way to the place

of crucifixion He saw the women weeping for Him in the streets, He said: 'Don't weep for me, but for yourselves and your children.' We remember how, when in the midst of His agony on the Cross, He saw the rough ignorant soldiers who had nailed Him on it, standing around and tossing for His clothes, He asked God to forgive them.

We know too well that we are far sorrier for ourselves than for other people, and sometimes so sorry for ourselves that our neighbours have to bear their burdens alone, so far as we are concerned. But Jesus kept on loving even through the lonely tragedy of His Passion. And that is half the meaning of the Cross. It is not just that He suffered and died (countless others have done that). It is because He went through it with a heart that wept for others and not for itself. That is why the Cross of Jesus is a revelation of the very best and highest kind of thing we could ever try to be, and also above all a revelation of the great loving heart of God.

2. *Jesus wept, but He went on.* The two processions are going in different directions: the one up the hill, away from Jerusalem, the other down the hill towards Jerusalem. Of course we are not blaming David. No doubt what he did was the best thing to do. But Jesus—He was a different kind of King, with a different kind of Kingdom, which could never be saved by turning back from danger, but only by going on to the Cross.

We may not count her armies, we may not see her king,
Her fortress is a faithful heart, her pride is suffering.

That was Christ's Kingdom; and so He did not ride up the hill out of danger, but down the hill, with a faithful heart.

It is very important to remember, when we are thinking of the Cross of Jesus, that all the time He could have turned back. When He saw the danger coming, long before this, He could quite easily have saved all the trouble by giving up saying and doing the things He did, retiring into private life again. Nothing would have pleased the authorities better and Jesus could have finished His days peacefully in Nazareth. Even in Gethsemane, when the band of His captors was drawing nearer, He might (as Dr. Glover has pointed out) have escaped: a few hours' walking would have put Him out of danger. But He went on to the Cross, because, come what might, He had to be valiant for truth and for God, and do His appointed task.

Thus it was not only love to man; it was also obedience to God and to truth and to duty. That is why the New Testament in one place describes the glory of it by saying that Jesus became 'obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.' It is the greatest act of obedience in the history of the world.

There are times in most lives when the path of duty is quite plain, but terribly hard to take. In these times we are all prone to substitute self-pity for obedience. But no tears can change the path of duty; and no life can be right that doesn't learn obedience to it. And where can we learn that better than from Jesus, who set His face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem?

3. *He wept, but He trusted in God.* If one were to ask which is the greatest passage about faith in the New Testament, or indeed in the world's literature, the answer would at once be the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, about how by faith one man did this, and by faith another man did that. And the long and eloquent passage comes to a climax by telling us that the supreme and outstanding example of faith in the whole history of the world was Jesus Christ. And what is the reason the writer gives, the thing he mentions that Jesus did by faith? Well, it was this—the way He faced the Cross.

In the story of David, too, there was faith, though it was of rather a desperate kind. 'Take the ark of God back to the city. If I find favour with the Lord, He will bring me back to let me see the ark and its abode; but if He says, "I take no pleasure in you," then here I am, let Him do to me as He thinks best.' That was noble, wasn't it? It was religious. He committed himself to God as he fled.

We can hardly read the words without thinking of the triumphant faith of Jesus Christ a thousand years after, when on the very eve of His crucifixion He cried to God, 'My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.' What was before Him looked like the black night of ghastly failure and complete tragedy—the end of everything He had ever cared for, all He had ever believed in. And yet He trusted absolutely in God. And so Jesus was already victor, with the victory of faith. As He rode along that road, weeping, to the city that was going to crucify Him, it was not really, in the light of eternity and of faith, inappropriate that the people around Him should be shouting Hosanna, spreading their garments on the road, and waving the green branches of victory. Risking everything for God, trusting utterly in God—it was what He had always taught men to do, whenever He spoke of faith; and now in the last terrible crisis He did it for Himself; and it is the greatest act of faith in the history of the world.

It has been the great source and secret of faith for everybody else ever since—the Cross of Jesus. It is terribly hard amid all the tragedies and contradictions and mysteries of this world to believe and trust in an eternal Purpose of good. But there is One who through nineteen long centuries has supremely helped people to do it, and just because of how He faced the greatest tragedy of all.

EASTER DAY

The End That Never Comes

BY THE REVEREND STUART W. McWILLIAM, M.A., S.T.M., ABERDEEN

'But Peter followed him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in, and sat with the servants, to see the end.'—Mt 26^{58}.

Many sermons have been preached on the words, 'Peter followed him afar off.' And I fear that most of them have done Peter but little justice. It took courage to enter the high priest's palace, the stronghold of the enemy, and if later Peter's courage faltered and then broke don't let us allow that fact to obscure the truth of his initial bravery. And who are we to criticize, whose discipleship has cracked under far less strain than that endured by Peter!

'To see the end'! It was a big human instinct that drew Peter into the high priest's palace to witness the closing act in His Master's life. The same instinct that took the disciples and the women to Calvary, the deep inescapable desire to be there at the end. The thing that brings many a man and many a woman from the uttermost parts of the earth when news reaches them that their father or their mother or some other dear one is dying and no train, no boat, no plane ever goes fast enough for one who travels on such a journey, so fierce is the desire to be there at the end. It is an inexplicable thing this human instinct to be there at the end and it operates in all kinds of different things. I remember when I left New York in June 1940. France was over-run, the B.E.F. seemed likely to be annihilated, the invasion and conquest of Britain appeared to be a foregone conclusion. Some American papers carried banner headlines—'This is the End!' All seemed to take it for granted that the collapse of Britain was only a matter of time and that the time was running out. And we couldn't get home quickly enough.

Peter sat with the disciples to see the end, the women and the disciples gathered at the Cross to see the end. But see Peter and these same disciples a few days later and they are entirely different men and women. Peter standing at the street corner in Jerusalem is declaring not the end but the beginning. 'It was not possible,' he cries, 'that Jesus should be holden of death.' He and his friends have discovered that there are some things which have no end. In the days before the discovery of America the Spanish coins carried a picture of the pillars of Hercules at the straits of Gibraltar and the inscription '*Ne plus ultra*,' 'There is Nothing Beyond.' But after the voyage of Columbus the inscription was altered to read '*Plus ultra*,' 'Something Beyond!' And this is the message of Easter. There is no end. There is something beyond.

1. *There is no End to the Power of God to bring Victory out of Defeat.* There was an end to what men could do to Jesus, a limit to what they could do to the love of God, and on Calvary they reached that limit. Humanly speaking it was complete victory for the powers which crucified Christ. Humanly speaking, but Easter is not the work of man but the Word of God and it reveals that there is no end to the power of God to win victory out of defeat. This is not just a message for Easter Sunday but for every day of our lives, and especially for those days when truth and beauty and love and friendship and purity and goodness are crucified before our eyes and we can only stand and wring our hands in sad lament. How long can it go on, the triumph of force? How far can injustice go—a long way, to-day and to-morrow but on the third day it breaks itself upon the fact of God. And all history bears witness to it. Rome fell beneath the attacks of the barbarian hordes and pious men cried, it is the end. But it wasn't the end. The Turks swept across Europe to the gates of Paris, and again men cried, it is the end, but it wasn't the end. The red floods of Communism have engulfed a great portion of the world and seem ever to be drawing nearer, and many voices cry, it is the end, but the end is not yet. Sooner or later, tyranny, cruelty, injustice and violence break upon the fact of God. And the truth that men have buried rises from the dead to confront them with its inescapable demands.

2. *There is no End to the Forgiveness of God.* If Christ had prayed on the Cross 'Father forgive them for they know not what they do' and then died and that had been the end of it, His words would have been remembered still as noble words befitting a noble death but nothing more. There would be in them no healing for the sin scarred souls of men and women. But He rose from the dead and it is our crucified and risen Saviour whose

ame we plead for our forgiveness. It doesn't natter what we are or what we have been, there is o end to the forgiveness of God. God goes on and n being sinned against and forgiving, and we must o on and on receiving forgiveness of God. There re things for which others may not be able to rgive us, things for which we may not be able to rgive ourselves ; but glory be, there is no end to he forgiveness of God.

3. *There is no End to the Companionship of Christ.* hat is what these disciples realized when the nessage of Easter penetrated their minds and their earts. Christ had risen and they would never need be alone again. In a way His death had brought Christ nearer to them. And this is the great truth or us, that there are many roads a man must travel long which he can take no human companion vith him, but there is no road which Christ is not villing to share. There are so many different forms f loneliness that may come upon men and women. The loneliness of suffering, which no one else can bear for us and no one else can understand, the oneliness of fear, for each man's fear is his own, he loneliness of sin by which a man feels himself ut off from all his fellows. And there is the oneliness of age, when we seem out of place and omehow out of touch with the world in which we ive. But the companionship of Christ can be urs to banish our loneliness and to His companion- hip there is no end—nothing can separate us rom the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

4. *There is no End to Life.* I have always been great admirer of Sir Walter Scott, and once I went on a kind of pilgrimage to Abbotsford, the ome he loved. I remember being shown his tudy and standing looking down at his desk vith the pen lying there where he had left it, and ecalling how to the very end he kept writing. nd almost one felt that he might at any moment eturn to lift the pen and continue the work vhich death interrupted. And so it is with all nen, death comes as an interruption. But the reat message of Easter is that it is only an nterruption. Christ rose from the dead. He ontinued His work. Luke says in his Preface to he Acts of the Apostles, 'The former treatise have made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began . . . o do.' And then he goes on to tell what Jesus is oing. There is no end to the life of Christ, and ecause He lives we shall live also ; and there is no nd to the life which we receive in Him.

The things which have no end. There is no end o the power of God to bring victory out of defeat, here is no end to the forgiveness of God, there is o end to the companionship of Christ, and there is o end to life—these are the things which Easter akes plain.

First Sunday after Easter

Life's Responsibility

By the Reverend John L. Kent, M.A., Cathcart, Glasgow

'Henceforth I call you not slaves . . . but I have called you friends.'—Jn 15^{15}.

In the last hours of His life our Lord was making known to His disciples the relationship that had existed all throughout His ministry between Him and them. 'Be sure of this,' He seems to be saying, 'I have never thought of you as the instruments of My will, the means by which My ends are to be achieved. I have taken you into My confidence, as friends.' His attitude had never been condescending, domineering or coercive. They were not slaves but friends.

This was always Christ's attitude not merely to His disciples but to all men. He knew what was in men, yet everywhere He treated them with the same respect as He paid His disciples. He did not need any to remind Him that man was ignorant, dull-witted and degraded, yet He regarded him ever and always as a responsible being. His high regard for man's integrity led Him to what we to-day would consider quite quixotic actions. To men who had proved poor students and of slow understanding, He declared, 'All things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.' While to a woman whose life had broken into pieces and who confessed to living in sin, He unlocked the richest treasures of His mind and heart. If people thought He was mad to behave like this, what did He care! This was the only way in which free, rational, responsible men and women should be treated. He did not want the unwilling and cowering response of slaves. He desired the glad, grateful and understanding trust of friends.

This basic insight to the true nature of man has put the whole world forever in debt to Jesus Christ. It is this idea of man as a responsible being that lies behind our conduct, both individual and social. The whole structure of our society is built upon it. Our law, our judicial system, our education, our form of democratic government rest on no other foundation than this. And it is important for us to remind ourselves that it came from no other philosophy, no other system of social ethics, no other religion. It came from Him who declared, 'I call you not slaves . . . I have called you friends.'

Yet, while this truth has gained all but universal acceptance, it seems impossible for man to

bring it into his clear consciousness and be consistent with it. Let us look at some of its perspectives.

Man must see himself and act as a responsible person. And apparently that is not easy. 'Our problem,' said Emerson, 'is not primarily to fit man to face his environment, but . . . to fit him to face himself.' If we are people of this stature and masters of our own fate, worthy to be called friends of Jesus, then we must closely examine ourselves to see the kind of character we possess. And then we are liable to make the discovery that Charles Kingsley made who, when asked what character he most disliked, answered, 'My own.'

So painful is this task of scrutinizing what we are making of ourselves that most of us are tempted to evade it. We crowd our programme from dawn to dusk so that we will have no time in which to sit down and look at ourselves. We will busy ourselves with good works, seeking to silence the voice of an uneasy conscience by helping the needy or uprooting injustice or breaking the chains of the enslaved.

Even if we do confront ourselves and have to admit our failure, we will plead extenuating circumstances. 'We desire to think nobly of ourselves,' says Professor Macneile Dixon, 'but the ship of life is so small and the sea of circumstance is so wide.' So we cannot stand in the same condemnation as others who have not sailed in our turbulent waters. Or we claim that we did not have a good start. We account for our failures by the faults of our parents and the poverty of our equipment. Yet all the while we know that not the quality of our inheritance but what we do with it determines our destiny.

To this extent God has put every one of us in charge of his own life. 'Live unto the dignity of thy nature, and leave it not disputable at last whether thou hast been a man,' was the challenge of old Sir Thomas Browne. Remember, Jesus sees in you what entitles Him to call you His friend and be true to it.

Man must see others and act towards them as responsible beings. This is part of the great legacy that Jesus Christ has bequeathed to mankind. He seems to be looking into the faces of all the passing generations of man when He says, 'I have called you friends.' It is the only attitude God intended man to adopt towards his brother man; therefore, finally, it is the only one that will work.

We are living in the midst of a new social revolution. It cannot adequately be described by using the captions that have applied to previous social struggles. It is not to be reckoned in terms merely of wages and conditions of work. It is much deeper than these. It is the demand, often unrecognized, of man to be accepted as a free, intelligent, self-respecting person in whatever place he fills in the community.

Therefore we must ever see our fellow-men in this light and frame our policies accordingly. Whatever denies this truth is wrong and whatever is consistent with it is right.

But this truth is capable of wider and more general application. It finds its place in our everyday attitude to our fellow-men and not merely in our specific policies. By and large, mankind can be divided into two classes—those who use their fellows and those who serve them. And what a temptation it is to use our fellows! We all succumb to it. We can cherish our friends or discard them according to the measure in which they serve our purposes. Not so Jesus. His fellow-men were not means to His ends. That was why He spent His life unto death in their service. On that last night His disciples had seen and heard Him at prayer, and in pouring out His heart to His heavenly Father He had said, 'For their sakes I sanctify myself.' To a similar dedication we are called who would honour our fellow-men as we ought. Friends.

Men must see themselves and others as responsible to God. For we must realize that we are not accountable to ourselves merely for what we are but to God who made us and who has decreed that one day we must stand before His presence. Nor are we responsible to our fellow-men for the value we set on them or the way we behave to them. We must answer to Him who designed our relationships with our brothers and made it possible for us to honour and serve them.

If we are free, rational and responsible persons, we are so because He made us. And we know that this is our true nature because He revealed it to us. Unless this is the truth, we are only groping and guessing. The conviction of faith is born of our sense of responsibility to God.

No person ever had a higher sense of personal responsibility than Florence Nightingale. How she fought that the woman she knew herself to be might realize herself! Nor has anyone more fully recognized her responsibility to her fellow-men. How she strove, not merely in the Crimea, but throughout her life that her brothers and sisters might become what they were intended to be. But that life began and was sustained during the years by what happened on the 7th February, 1837. That was the day, the anniversary of which she faithfully celebrated, when she made her account with God.

'For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ,' says the Apostle Paul. True, that great day must come in the eternal Kingdom. But it must also happen now. There can be no honouring of life's responsibility, to ourselves or

our brother-men, without first acknowledging our responsibility to God.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

The Discipline of Suffering

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, M.A., CRAMOND

'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.'—Job 1^{21}.

From the very earliest beginnings of conscious human life men have concerned themselves with the problem of suffering. Primitive man took what measures he deemed desirable to propitiate the spirits that inhabited stone and wood, and rock and tree, so that his crops might not be blighted, that his children should not die from some mysterious pestilence, nor his enemies work his ruin. Now the Jew made the problem more difficult. He declared that life was not just at the mercy of capricious and quite unpredictable powers, it was controlled by a righteous God, who demanded of men that they do justly and love mercy, and walk humbly with their God. By so doing he made the problem of suffering much more acute, for how are men to walk humbly and unquestioningly with an all-controlling God who, on palpable evidence which none of us can evade, appears so often to do far from justly, and acts not only without mercy but with a kind of calculated cruelty that simply staggers our faith? This Book of Job is a great and honest and sincere attempt to face the problem thus made acute.

Here in the Prologue we are reminded of three truths, all of them positive and helpful.

First, *under the discipline of suffering every sufferer becomes a test case.* In the Prologue the Lord asks Satan, 'the adversary,' if he has observed the goodness of Job. It is thus made plain that God is aware of the uprightness of His servant, and is proud of it. What a grand thought, that any of us blind and blundering mortals should be able so to live that God should be proud of us! But the adversary has been rendered deeply cynical by his long experience of seeking out the worst in human nature, and suggests that Job is good only because goodness so unmistakably pays. Here is an incidental and implied challenge to us all. Why are we good, in so far as we manage to be good? Out of love and respect for God, from a desire to do that which is well-pleasing in His sight, or because it pays? Satan quite boldly suggests that if it is made plain to Job that goodness does not pay dividends in immunity from trouble and suffering he will soon turn and curse God. Taking up the challenge God makes of Job a test case. He is testing not only Job's personal reaction to this trial but the responsiveness of human nature. Has God in fact succeeded in creating persons capable of such fellowship with God, that, though terribly tried, they will continue to trust Him, and still do as He desires? Every man or woman who falls under the discipline of suffering is a test case both for God and for humanity.

The discipline of suffering tests the adequacy of the sufferer's thoughts of God. This Book teaches throughout that the suffering is sent, or at least permitted, by God. There is a very important principle here which demands most careful thinking. All the characters in the drama regard the suffering as being sent by God. Now a very little thought will show us that there is a great deal of suffering which God does not send, and for which He is not responsible. When some woman, turned monster in human form, herds her fellow-women into the gas-chamber at Dachau, is that an act of God? When a father and mother—save the name—take it in turn to beat a child of three to death, is that an act of God? When a young girl, in hospital for a minor operation, is given a wrong anaesthetic and dies, is that an act of God? No! It is an act of criminal human negligence. Even when we are trying to understand natural disasters we must not think of God giving instructions to the powers of His universe to strike. We just cannot picture the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ 'sending' His winds and waves, His floods and avalanches about their duties of destruction. And yet, and yet, God is still responsible, for if this is still God's world, and He is still in control, none of these things could happen without His knowledge and consent. God is responsible for the evil, the terrible evil He has left us free to do to each other, and for the terrifying powers of this strange world in which He has set us to live. That is very important. At first sight it seems to make the problem even worse. But try to consider the matter from the point of view of those who actually suffer, or endure the agony of watching their loved ones suffer. Does it really help them if you suggest that there is in life some evil power, fighting against God and often winning real victories, a power of evil that now and then gets out of hand and runs amok, and that this is the explanation of the suffering they have to face? Is it not better, whatever it cost, to keep the picture of God in control, setting limits to the power of evil, making it serve His purpose, letting it happen—yes—but still not losing grip? Ask those who have really suffered and they will tell you that you can go on bearing it, trusting where you cannot understand, if you believe, in this deep and sustaining sense

that it comes with God's knowledge and consent, and therefore with His power and wisdom and love still at work in it.

The final truth that must be noted is that *the discipline of suffering is a test of character and faith for the sufferer himself.* It is a fact of observation and experience that suffering of the same quantity and quality may come to different people, and they will react differently, according to the kind of people they are. Some are, unquestionably, refined and strengthened by what they have to suffer, they find new depths in themselves, out of their own suffering they distil, by some mysterious alchemy, a new sympathy for the sorrows of others. There are also those who simply crumple up under suffering, rail at God and fate, cannot see why God did this to them. They turn to self-pity, love to tell of their misfortunes. Nothing so tests us, reveals what we are, as suffering. It may well be that we are moved to ask: 'Why should God thus put us to the test?' It all depends what we think life is for. If the horizons of our thinking are bounded by this human existence, here and now, if the ideal of life is that a good time should be had by all, then, of course, such testing can serve no good purpose. But if this present life is intended as a preparation and apprenticeship for another and fuller kind of life, if it is designed to reveal the grandeur of humanity at its best, then such testing has clear and discernible purpose.

The final and abiding impression which the Prologue to the Book of Job leaves on the mind is that of the tremendous trust God reposes in His much-tried servant. What a great thought that the degree of suffering God sends, or allows to come with His knowledge and consent, is the measure of His trust in us. If He should ever so terribly trust any of us, may He give us grace to rise to the dignity of Job's grand response: 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.'

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

By Many or By Few

BY THE REVEREND T. R. MILFORD, M.A., CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF LINCOLN

'There is no restraint to the LORD to save by many or by few.'—1 S 14^{6}.

These words were spoken by Jonathan to his armour-bearer. Saul was preparing his revolt against the Philistines, and the enemy held a strong point commanding the pass near Michmash. Jonathan and his armour-bearer climbed up the cliff on hands and feet, took the Philistines by surprise, and killed about twenty of them. This little incident marked the turning of the tide, and was the beginning of Saul's victories, which in their turn led to the establishment of the independent kingdom, first of Saul, and then of David and his successors.

The text is echoed in 1 Macc 3^{18}. Once again Israel is fighting for its independence against a heathen power, and Judas Maccabaeus said to his followers, 'With heaven it is all one, to save by many or by few; For victory in battle standeth not in the multitude of an host; but strength is from heaven. They come unto us in fulness of insolence and lawlessness, to destroy us and our wives and our children, . . . But we fight for our lives and our laws.'

This version resembles the faith which inspired the Greeks at Marathon and Salamis, and which Macaulay puts into the mouth of Horatius defending the bridge. It is the faith of many small peoples in ancient and modern times who have ventured all for freedom. The words are echoed again in the prayer to be said before a fight at sea against any enemy: 'Stir up thy strength, O Lord, and come and help us; for thou givest not always the battle to the strong, but canst save by many or by few.' And there is surely a further echo of them in Sir Winston Churchill's famous words spoken after the Battle of Britain—'Never has so much been owed by so many to so few.' And we, remembering what the Royal Navy and Air Force have meant to us, remembering that we owe to them nothing less than our survival, can never hear these words except with reverence and gratitude.

Is it true that the just cause always wins, even though the big battalions are on the other side, and the technical skill and armaments? In the light of the facts of history, we cannot say so. In face of the Bible we dare not say so. On whose side was justice, human justice, when Joshua's hordes invaded Palestine? But the writers of the Bible, and the actors in the Biblical drama, are concerned, not with justice or liberty as such, but with the sovereignty of God, and His purpose in the calling of Israel.

What then is saved, sometimes by 'many' and sometimes by 'few'? Not merely the cause of right, not merely truth, which somehow, somewhere, springs up again though all seemed lost; not merely the eternal values which cannot be destroyed. It is something much more definite and quite concrete. It is the purpose of God, a purpose of goodwill which is in the end meant for all mankind, and the People of the Saints of the Most High in whom at any given moment it is embodied. The fortunes of the people of God at times coincide

with the fortunes of Saul or of David, but at other times not. The victory at Michmash and the disaster of Mount Gilboa are equally part of the saving action of God; the saving of Jerusalem from Assyria in Isaiah's time, and its conquest by Nebuchadnezzar, the victories of Judas Maccabaeus and the subjugation of Israel by Rome, are all equally necessary. This is the meaning of the sign of Jonah. And the crisis is reached, and its abiding formula is summed up, in the death and resurrection of the One who gave His life a ransom for many. The pattern is continued in the doings of those few to whom He gave His Spirit and who went out to make disciples of all the nations. The religion of Christ crucified became the official faith of the Western world, and the many flocked in to share in the triumph of the once despised minority.

So it has been throughout the subsequent history of the Church, reflecting a pattern which, once we have seen it, can be recognized also in natural evolution. Sometimes the climate, as it were, is genial. Art, government and culture flourish under the banner of the Church, and it seems possible to have the best of both worlds at once. The Church itself resembles a banyan tree with many trunks and roots, luxuriating in a rich soil and enjoying a balmy air, and all the fowls of the air make their habitation in its branches. But such times have their own special dangers and temptations. The Church is in danger of assimilation to the world, when Christian people take their ease in Zion. And then are raised up small protesting groups, monks in the desert, or puritanical sects announcing this world's gains for loss,' choosing poverty and squalor, and often facing persecution, that they may preserve intact the one thing needful. Through them the life of the many is purified and redeemed.

Or, again, the secular climate changes. The old order is dissolved through external invasion or internal collapse, and the Church is reduced to the dimensions of the lichen clinging to the rock, living on the iron ration of a faith without any visible encouragement. Such were the faithful few in Germany under Hitler, such are they now in many parts of the world.

The Church in the West has had a long period of prosperity and even of dominance. In England in particular the Church of England had honour, wealth and great prestige. And even when the virtual monopoly of the established Church was destroyed by the great movements of the Spirit among the people (each of which began with a few faithful men who 'could do no other'), the Christian body as a whole could make a fair show of providing the conscience of the nation, and could claim with some justice, as at the time of the Education Act of 1944, that the people loved to have it so.

It is slowly being borne in upon us that, mainly as the result of the two great wars, everything is changed. Churchgoing is no longer to anything like the same extent part of the regular social pattern—far less here than it is still in the United States. No longer is there any social or material advantage in being a Christian. Regular worshippers are everywhere a minority, in many places a very small minority. But still in this ambiguous land it seems quite natural for the troops to attend cathedrals and parish churches on great national occasions.

This situation of deferred crisis is one which the Bible attributes to God's 'longsuffering.' In this view our survival in two great wars, and the fact that we have still great power and responsibility abroad, combined with the many signs that the present position is unstable—all these are a call to repentance while there is yet time. There are no signs at all of a mass return to faith, but rather signs that each generation has exhausted a little more of its inherited spiritual capital. There are no signs at all that overseas missions are going to find increasing opportunities for expansion; but rather signs that restrictions will increase, and costs too, as the traditional 'mission-field' countries assert their independence and develop their industries.

If this is so, the Church both here and overseas must expect to be saved and to save, by 'few' rather than by 'many'; and that means, less by a general infiltration of the mass, and more by the witness of a few intransigent extremists; less by those who are conforming to the world, and more by those who are carrying out costly and self-denying experiments.

Established churches and official leaders in the nature of things must represent the 'many.' Revolutionary actions and risky experiments cannot be expected of them. But some God calls to a witness that seems eccentric; to an extreme perhaps of pacifism or voluntary poverty or heroic identification with Indian villagers or native Africans, or to a life of concentrated prayer. As in the past, so now, some few of the few will turn out to have indeed been given the saving word by which the faith of the many will be renewed. And those in turn, still few in proportion, may save the world from disaster. But God does not promise visible success; and even we who in peaceful times rely so much on public opinion and all men speaking well of us, must be prepared, if need be, to find ourselves in a small and diminishing minority, without even the certainty that we are right. He saves, but it is not for us to say whether in our time it is to be by many or by few.

Recent Foreign Theology

Samaria under the Omrids. Samaria first became an Israelite royal city in the time of Omri, and from the Old Testament we learn that the Omrid kings also had a residence in Jezreel. Professor A. Alt, in a short study issued by the Leipzig Academy,[1] presents the novel theory that Omri bought the site of Samaria and erected there a city whose population was mainly Canaanite. In Samaria, therefore, the Omrids reigned in a city which was their private property, whereas in Jezreel they reigned as the kings of the nation. This state of affairs continued until Jehu overthrew the dynasty of Omri. Professor Alt is one of the most stimulating of Old Testament scholars in the world, and his contributions to the study of history have been particularly important. His new theory is not, therefore, a mere curiosity of scholarship, but the view of an eminent scholar, who brings to its defence a strong armoury.

A Posthumous Essay. Professor B. Holwerda, of Kampen, who was a conservative scholar of high promise, died at a very early age before he had published much. His conservatism was not of the type that is ill-informed of the work of other schools; his ample library showed the range of his reading, and the present writer will long remember being a guest in his home. His family has now issued the first of some volumes of lectures which he left, in which his essential qualities are reflected. This is the first part of a work entitled *A History of Old Testament Revelation*, but it deals only with Gn 25^{19}–35^{29}, which it calls *tôledôt yischâq*.[2] The range of the author's reading is indicated in the references to other works, and his conservatism in his rejection of documentary criticism of the Pentateuch. The תולדות headings in Genesis are treated as introductions, not of genealogies, but of the whole succeeding sections. Hence in Gn 25^{19} he finds the introduction to the whole history of Esau and Jacob. His primary interest, as the title of the volume indicates, is in the thought of the chapters, where he brings out the theme of election. If the author had lived long enough to complete a work on the whole of the Old Testament with this fullness and detail it would have been a very large work. We may be grateful, however, that something has been made available, though it may be added that a good index would have added much to its value.

[1] *Der Stadtstaat Samaria* [1954]. Akademie Verlag, Berlin; DM 3.

[2] *Dictaten*, vol. 1: *Historia Revelationis Veteris Testamenti*, Part 1 [1954]. Brill, Leiden; Fl. 10.

Myth and History in the Old Testament. Professor J. Hempel has published a small book, which appeared first in article form in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, under the title *Faith, Myth, and History in the Old Testament*.[3] In it he examines the relation of myth and history in the Old Testament and finds a process of the historification of myth, or the expression of the motifs of ancient myths in terms of history in which the saving acts of God were seen. He studies in turn cosmogonic myth, soteriological myth and theophanic myth. The full documentation alone gives high value to this work, which offers a guide to a wide range of literature. In addition the author brings his own stimulating mind to the subject, so that even without the footnotes it would still be of importance out of relation to its length. The importance of myth for faith is seen in its use for eschatology, and in its relation to the reigning king and the ideal future king.

The Epistle to the Hebrews. A further volume in the French Protestant Commentary on the New Testament is by J. Héring, and is on the Epistle to the Hebrews.[4] The Introduction is very brief, and Professor Héring contents himself with recording the various views that have been expressed as to the authorship and destination of the Epistle, without indicating his own views. We cannot know the answers to these questions, and he apparently thinks speculation is profitless. As to the date he does not think we need to come down below A.D. 70. The strength of Héring's work lies in the verse by verse commentary. Each section is preceded by his own translation of the text. At the end there are four very brief appendices. One rejects the view that the Epistle was addressed to the sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls, since the New Covenant figures in the Synoptics and in the Pauline epistles no less than in the Scrolls, and there is no reference to the Teacher of Righteousness. Another devotes a single page to the matter of semitisms in the language, and raises the question whether certain semitisms in the Epistle may not rather be coptisms, especially if the author were an Alexandrian Jew.

St. Paul's Speech at Athens. A Swedish dissertation by Dr. Bertil Gärtner is devoted to a re-

[3] *Glaube, Mythos und Geschichte im Alten Testament* [1954]. Töpelmann, Berlin; DM. 6.80.

[4] *L'Épître aux Hébreux.* (*Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*, xii.) [1954]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel and Paris.

examination of St. Paul's speech at Athens.[1] The author critically reviews the treatment of the subject by others, and examines the speech in the light of St. Luke's methods and in the light of the ideas found in St. Paul's epistles, and gives a phrase by phrase study of the speech itself. He offers good grounds for concluding that its Pauline character cannot be dismissed, since it contains no item which clashes with what is known of Paul's theology, and though there are some things which are not paralleled in his epistles, it is unreasonable to assume that we can conclude from them everything he could ever have said. The speech itself is held to be Luke's composition on the basis of solid tradition and to give a specimen of the Diaspora preaching which the Christian Gentile missionaries had taken over from the Jews, and imbued with their own special message. On the vexed question whether St. Paul is represented as put on trial before the court of the Areopagus, or merely as speaking on Mars' Hill, the author thinks it probable that an unofficial and informal inquiry by the commission was intended, since there is no mention of any court decision. In the earlier part of the book the author critically examines the theory of natural revelation in relation to the Old Testament, Stoic, and Jewish writings, and shows that there is a fundamental difference between Stoic thought and Old Testament and Jewish thought. He finds no place for the Stoic doctrine in the Areopagus speech, but only for the Old Testament and Jewish tradition. The dissertation rests on very wide reading, and is marked by fairness towards those with whom the author disagrees and acute argument in favour of his own moderate conclusions.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University

[1] *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, No. xxi.) [1955]. Gleerup, Lund ; Sw. Cr. 20.

Entre Nous

Preaching to People's Needs

In regard to books on preaching ' hope springs eternal in the human breast.' And the odd thing is that seldom or never does one read through a book on preaching without finding something valuable. *How to Preach to People's Needs,* by Mr. Edgar N. Jackson (Abingdon Press ; $2.75), has an unusual approach. Mr. Jackson knows that nowadays most preachers have some kind of knowledge of psychology and of the insights which it brings. ' But,' he goes on to say, ' there has been little or no interest in these matters as they relate to the function of preaching as a therapeutic tool.' It is as a ' therapeutic tool ' that this book approaches preaching.

The method is to take a certain area where help is needed—Preaching to the Guilt-laden, Preaching to the Fearful, Preaching to those bothered by Alcohol, Preaching to the Insecure, Preaching to the Defeated, and so on—and in an introductory section to discuss and to analyse the problem ; and then to provide three sermons in outline which can help to cure the condition under discussion. In all, sixteen such subjects are discussed.

Mr. Jackson outlines what he believes to be a cross-section of an ordinary congregation : ' In a congregation of five hundred people, it is reasonable to assume that at least one hundred have been so recently bereaved as to feel an acute sense of loss. Probably a third of the married persons are facing problems of personality adjustment that may weaken or destroy their home life. At least half of the five hundred can be assumed to have problems of emotional adjustment to school, work, home, or community that endanger their happiness. Others may have neuroses ranging from alcohol addiction to lesser forms of obsessions and anxiety states. Perhaps fifteen or more are homosexually inclined and another twenty-five depressed. Another hundred may be suffering from so great a feeling of guilt or fear of discovery that their peace of mind and health are jeopardized. The rare individual with complete peace of mind and soul is probably surrounded by those who are carrying several heavy burdens within.' In each case, as Fosdick said, each person must be led to see himself, ' not as part of the problem but as part of the solution.'

Mr. Jackson has no low view of the help that the Church can bring. It is not the Church's function ' to give aspirin for malignancy and sprinkle rose-water on the deep wounds of the insecure.' But Mr. Jackson's approach is essentially kind. Ian Maclaren advised his students : ' Be kind to every one, for all are having a hard time.' The man who is up against his problem or his sins ' wants more strength, not more scolding.' ' The concern of God is not to fill people with a sense of guilt, but to use the feeling of guilt as a door of understanding to open new opportunities for living. So guilt leads to confession, and confession leads to freedom, and freedom leads to new life, and God is at work in each step of the way.'

In speaking of faith Mr. Jackson has interesting things to say. ' The process of growth is often stimulated by the head-on collision between an

active mind and dogma.' A developing faith develops at three levels. '*Belief* is the intellectual basis for faith. *Conviction* is the expression of faith at the emotional level. *Action* is the involvement of the being in the fulfilment of the mental and emotional aspects of faith at the level of total personality.'

This is a book written by a man with a flaming desire to help others who are going through it, and all who share in that desire—and surely that is every preacher—will find themselves helped by this book. WILLIAM BARCLAY

The Widow's Mite : A Modern Parallel

The following incident is related in Chester Wilmot's book, *The Struggle for Europe*.[1] It occurred during the liberation of Brussels by the British Guards Division.

'By late afternoon the Guards were entering Brussels, and as they drove nearer the heart of the city the crowds thickened and the tumult grew. . . . In one square the tanks were halted by the throng and the Brussels police attempted to move the crowd back, but they could not restrain one little old woman who wore on her drab black dress her husband's medals from another war. She made a quick dart across to the nearest jeep, took the hand of the driver, kissed it, and said, "Je vous remercie, Tommy. Je vous remercie." And into his hand she pressed what was obviously all that she had—three cigarettes.'

There are two points that strike me here. First that the writer of a book describing within the compass of seven hundred and seventeen pages the world-shaking events of 1942–45 should find space for so apparently trivial an event as this incident of the widow and her three cigarettes, just as Jesus singled out the widow and her two mites from the stream of worshippers casting their gifts into the Temple treasury.

And, secondly, it provides me with an answer to a question that has always puzzled me. Why did the widow during a routine act of worship cast into the treasury all that she had? That is not a normal action for any of us. The answer is that she too, like her Belgian counterpart, was acting on the compulsion of overflowing gratitude for a great deliverance. I like to think that Jesus knew about it, and that in fact He was the author of that deliverance. W. E. MONTGOMERY

Roses in December

Roses in December is the title of a charming little anthology by Lady Robertson Nicoll. It has been printed privately but copies may be had from Messrs. Wyllie, Union Street, Aberdeen.

In her Introduction Lady Robertson Nicoll says :

'I have compiled this little book in the hope that it may be of help and encouragement to others when "the path narrows and the company is few" . . .

'I observed the courage and the wisdom which many were able to bring to the problems confronting old age, and in my reading I noted how various people approached their advancing years. In particular I was impressed by the attitude of Thackeray's delightful daughter, Lady Ritchie, whom I met when she was seventy-four, and charmingly dressed as a real old lady in a bonnet and grey silk dress with black lace. She kept her vivid interest in friends and books to the last, and lived up to her own philosophy : "I mean to enjoy old age as much as I can, and I do feel that the happiness of the old makes peace for others ; and, as Huxley said to his wife, 'It should be the cheerful acceptance of the inevitable.'" '

John xiv. 19

The Promise Book, by Dr. and Mrs. Church (Epworth Press ; 4s. net), is a devotional year book giving a text, a meditation and a prayer for each week. It is a worthy successor to their six 'Homely Year' books.

We quote week fifteen.

'"Because I live, ye shall live also." Here is what Alexander Maclaren called "*the timeless present tense*." Once Jesus said "Before Abraham was, I am" and now He says "Because *I live*." There was no beginning and there is no ending to the life of God. We are spirits, created by the Eternal. We wonder whether He will end the spiritual life He gave, when our body fails us. Jesus answers our question. Because He lives we, children of God's creating, shall live. To me, as to many another, this means we shall live as long as He lives.

'In Richard Hillary's great book, *The Last Enemy*, the young airman, terribly burned, is visited by Denise, the widow of his friend Peter who has been killed. Richard is groping for the Truth to satisfy his insufficient theory of self-realization. Peter had a strong Christian faith, and Denise tries to show Richard what it means to her now. "For a moment the darkness outside becomes brightness," she says. "We have a glimpse of what lies beyond this life. I believe not only in life after death, but in life before death . . . in a state not of being but of becoming."

'As Maclaren says, "Christ is living and life-giving," and this promise of Jesus means Easter Day for you and me.'

[1] P. 474.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.